

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:
H. R. 2170. A bill for the relief of Jeanette C. Jones and minor children; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARRY:
H. R. 2171. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Thomas P. Pendergrast; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROLPH:
H. R. 2172. A bill for the relief of Joseph Arraes (also known as Joseph Arraes); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROWAN:
H. R. 2173. A bill for the relief of Raymond James Perz; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SASSCER:
H. R. 2174. A bill for the relief of Ellen S. Huber; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2175. A bill for the relief of William F. Schmeltz; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2176. A bill for the relief of Howard B. Hill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2177. A bill for the relief of Earl J. Huber; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2178. A bill for the relief of the Service Fire Insurance Co. of New York; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2179. A bill for the relief of the leader of the Naval Academy Band; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2180. A bill for the relief of Kenton L. Mullenax; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2181. A bill for the relief of John G. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2182. A bill for the relief of John E. Haas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:
H. R. 2183. A bill for the relief of Mathilde B. Meister; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SASSCER:
H. R. 2184. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to set aside the trial-board conviction of Policeman William F. Fey and his resultant dismissal and to reinstate William F. Fey to his former position as a member of the Metropolitan Police Department; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

253. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition signed by Gladys H. Garrick and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 1111; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

254. By Mr. MUNDT: Petition of the South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing Congress concerning the condition of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

255. Also, petition of the South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing Congress to investigate the possibility of establishing a synthetic rubber plant at Yankton, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

256. By Mr. MOTT: House Joint Memorial No. 5 of the Forty-second Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, petitioning the Congress of the United States to give unfavorable consideration to and to defeat the enactment of Senate bill 246 and House bills 1012 and 1115, each of which provides amendments to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

257. By Mr. RAMEY: Petition of the Toledo Branch, of which Mrs. J. Shuller is president and Mrs. Ben Latex is secretary, Pioneer Women's Organization, urging that action be taken for the relief of the persecuted Jews in Nazi-occupied Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

258. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Journeymen Barbers' International Union of

America, Local No. 148, San Francisco, Calif., relative to rationing program of the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

259. Also, resolution of the Waiters' and Dairy Lunch Men's Union, Local 30, San Francisco, Calif., relative to the rationing program of the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

260. Also, resolution of the Apartment and Hotel Employees' Union, Local No. 14, San Francisco, Calif., relative to rationing program of the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

261. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, No. 1668, San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to end the colonial system of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

262. Also, petition of the clerk of the house of representatives, Legislature of Oregon, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bills 1012 and 1115 and Senate bill 246; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

263. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution pledging the unqualified support of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island to the Governor in his efforts to make available to the United States Navy for a firing range, the Wickaboxet State Forest in lieu of 6,680 acres of taxable land in East Greenwich, West Greenwich, Exeter, and North Kingstown; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 12, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 9, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we would turn in this sacred moment from the brazen vessels of governance to the golden bowls full of incense which are the prayers of the saints, conscious that more things are wrought by prayer than this world of facts and figures dreams of. As responsible servants of the Commonwealth we pause, deeply concerned about the spiritual verities without which our fleeting lives are but vanity and our boasted democracy destined not long to endure.

On this world day of prayer, when in countless sanctuaries in all lands in agony of spirit anguished lips lift up the ancient words, "Out of the depths do we cry unto Thee," we would humbly bow at this altar of devotion beneath the white dome, symbol of religious freedom, linking our petitions with all those whose hope and help is in God. On this dedicated day we fervently pray for the cleansing of our own hearts and the speedy coming of the glad day of the Lord when politics and commerce and industry and letters—the whole round circle of human activities—shall be purged and purified and in the shining splendor of service held up to Thee, an offering well pleasing in Thy sight. Hear our prayer, as we tread softly the altar stairs of our common humanity. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, March 11, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Taylor, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2030) to permit the shipment tax-free of certain tobacco products to territories of the United States for the use of members of the military and naval forces of the United States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1749) to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to grant hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits in certain World War No. 2 cases, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gillette	Radcliffe
Austin	Guffey	Reed
Bailey	Gurney	Revercomb
Ball	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hayden	Robertson
Barkley	Hill	Scruggs
Bilbo	Holman	Shipstead
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Brooks	Kilgore	Taft
Buck	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Lodge	Tobey
Byrd	Lucas	Truman
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Mead	Walsh
Daneher	Millikin	Wheeler
Davis	Moore	Wherry
Downey	Murdock	White
Eastland	Nye	Wiley
Ellender	O'Daniel	Willis
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Wilson
George	Overton	
Gerry	Pepper	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALL-GREEN] are detained on official business of the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent on public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (S. Doc. No. 20)

A letter from the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures, submitting, pursuant to law, an additional report of the joint committee relating to the regional agricultural credit corporation in their relation to the Federal agricultural lending policy (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS

A letter from the Administrator of the Office of Lend-Lease Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eighth quarterly report on operations under the Lend-Lease Act for the period ended March 11, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the operations of the Corporation for the month of November 1942 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, War, Navy, and Agriculture (2); Veterans' Administration, and The National Archives which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of Long Beach Parlor, No. 154, Native Daughters of the Golden West, of Long Beach, Calif., protesting against the formation of a Japanese unit of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution by a meeting of the sixteenth annual Anti-Saloon League Conference in St. Petersburg, Fla., favoring the enactment of legislation to prohibit liquor sales in the vicinity of military camps and war-production areas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Topeka, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 880, to prohibit liquor sales in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GURNEY (for himself and Mr. BUSHFIELD):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 9

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States for the passage of an act incorporating the principles of the Townsend national recovery plan substantially as set forth in a bill entitled 'H. R. 1649' introduced in the House of Representatives in the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States on February 2, 1943, by Representative PAR CANNON of Florida providing substantially as follows: 'To provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children, to provide an ever expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.'

"To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled in the seventy-eighth session:

"Whereas with full recognition that as first in importance to America, is the winning of the war, we also recognize that second in importance is the winning of a lasting and satisfactory peace; and

"Whereas after the soldier boys in all the branches of the armed forces have won the military victory, we who have stayed at home, should not have it said of us that we have made a mess of the home front by neglecting to provide full employment and the means for them to make a living when they come home; and

"Whereas when the war is over America will have, through her marvelous machines, more production capacity, with less manpower than ever before known in history; and

"Whereas with appropriate action taken we will be able to produce enough for all, assuming that our industrial and agricultural plants remain intact; and

"Whereas, this bill H. R. 1649 provides for buying power in a continuous stream round and round in the market by its forced spending clause and the money will never be lost; and

"Whereas benefits are provided for those permanently disabled either through accident or illness which will care for the disabled soldier boys as well as all other citizens who are disabled and also widows with children, thus making them an asset to the community rather than a liability since they will help to sustain a constant and dependable market; and

"Whereas the old folks and those incapacitated for work and widows with small children to support, have not been able to participate in the prosperity brought about by the war effort and are now and will be in a worse financial condition after the war than before; and

"Whereas it is the purpose of this bill, H. R. 1649, first, to provide voluntary retirement for some 5,000,000 persons over 60 years of age, and provide jobs for several million persons under 60 years of age; second, to decrease if not eliminate expenditures for relief; third, to stimulate trade and industry by increasing the purchasing power of persons of advanced age, those incapacitated and widows having the care of children, producing employment for younger people, thus keeping the wheels of industry going: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the house of representatives concurring), That we do hereby petition the Congress of the United States of America for the consideration at this seventy-eighth session of Congress of said Townsend national recovery plan bill, H. R. 1649, into law so it will be in operation when the war is over to provide full employment in post-war times and to care for the crippled and maimed soldier boys and the aged citizens. The said plan being deemed just and equitable to all persons of the United States; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the State of South Dakota transmit a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of South Dakota, and that they and each of them be requested to use all honorable means within their power to bring about the enactment of said H. R. 1649 into law at the earliest possible moment."

By Mr. WILLIS:

A concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress of the United States to lift restrictions and priorities on batteries used for telephones and radios for farms and residents in rural communities

"Whereas telephones and radios in rural and farm communities are of great convenience and of practical necessity in securing information relative to farm work and community affairs necessary in the war effort; and

"Whereas the restrictions and priorities placed on these commodities by the Federal Government have resulted in great inconvenience to farms and residents of rural communities, thereby retarding the efforts necessary to carry on the work necessary to aid the war efforts: Be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the house of representatives concurring),

"SECTION 1. That we respectfully urge and memorialize Congress to lift the priorities and restrictions on batteries used for rural telephones and radios and batteries used by farmers and residents in rural communities so that a sufficient supply of such commodities may be available, as telephones and radios are necessities in these communities, in that they are the only quick means of a communication."

RESOLUTIONS OF TOWN OF WATERBURY AND VERMONT STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two brief resolutions, one by the town of Waterbury, Vt., in which the town of Waterbury pledges:

To help win, at whatever personal cost, the victory which will erase forever from the minds of all men ideas of "master races" and of people who have the destiny and the power to dominate and enslave other peoples.

Also—

Resolved, That the town of Waterbury pledges to help work for a peace in which the United States recognizes to the full and fulfills her responsibilities in a world of free peoples.

I also present another resolution, adopted by the Vermont State Chamber of Commerce, to the same effect.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on

Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF TOWN OF WATERBURY, VT.

Whereas the Axis governments, in their folly and madness and crime, conceive that they are wise enough and strong enough to destroy and annihilate other nations and to rule the world.

Resolved, That the town of Waterbury pledges to help win, at whatever personal cost, the victory which will erase forever from the minds of all men ideas of "master races" and of people who have the destiny and the power to dominate and enslave other peoples.

Resolved, That the town of Waterbury pledges to help work for a peace in which the United States recognizes to the full and fulfills her responsibilities in a world of free peoples.

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to Members of Congress.

VERMONTERS AND THE FUTURE

In view of the plans and the ambitions of the governments forming the Axis powers,

Resolved, That we Vermonters, gathered at the annual meeting of the Vermont State Chamber of Commerce, pledge ourselves to help win, at whatever personal cost, the victory which will erase forever from the minds of all men ideas of "master races" and of people who have the destiny and the power to dominate and enslave other peoples.

Resolved, That we Vermonters pledge to help work for a peace in which the United States recognizes to the full and fulfills her responsibilities in a world of free peoples: and

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to the Members of Congress.

VERMONT STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.
MONTPELIER, June 11, 1942.

RESOLUTIONS OF INDEPENDENT FARMERS OF KANSAS—MANPOWER FOR AGRICULTURE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred resolutions adopted by the board of governors of Independent Farmers of Kansas at their annual meeting in Topeka, Kans., on February 20, 1943.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there has been introduced into Congress H. R. 1186 and H. R. 1187; and

Whereas the Independent Farmers of Kansas are in hearty accord with the provisions of these two bills; and

Whereas the Independent Farmers of Kansas are deeply concerned with the suggested administration and distribution of manpower for farms; and

Whereas we are deeply concerned with the confusion and resentment we believe will follow if such distribution of manpower for agriculture is assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Independent Farmers of Kansas heartily endorse H. R. 1186 and H. R. 1187, as presented by Congressman Ed REES, and we shall expect your active support and approval of this program; be it further

Resolved, That we protest any attempt of the War Manpower Commission to delegate to the authorities of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration the distribution of manpower relating to agriculture; be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of every Member of the Kansas delegation in Congress, including Senators CAPPER and REED; to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, and to the chairman of the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives.

INDEPENDENT FARMERS OF KANSAS,
OTTO GEFFERT, President.
GREENLEAF, KANS.

CONFIRMATION BY SENATE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—RESOLUTION OF LOCAL No. 1, UNITED FEDERAL WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter received by me from Local No. 1, United Federal Workers of America, located in Washington. In the letter there was enclosed a resolution on the so-called McKellar bill which they have adopted and which they ask to have printed in the RECORD. I ask that both the letter and the resolution be printed.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL 1, UNITED FEDERAL
WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1943.
Senator ALEEN W. BARKLEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BARKLEY: The members of Local 1, United Federal Workers of America, C. I. O., adopted a resolution urging the defeat of the McKellar bill at their monthly meeting on March 3.

We would like to have the resolution read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLOTTE CHATFIELD,
President, Local 1.

Whereas the McKellar bill, S. 575, calls for Presidential nomination and Senate confirmation of thousands of Federal employees; and

Whereas the bill will decrease efficiency in the Federal service by substituting the patronage system for the merit system; and

Whereas the morale of Federal employees will be threatened until the task of confirmation is completed; and

Whereas the enormous task of confirmation will distract the President and the Senate from important war work: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Local 1, United Federal Workers of America, C. I. O., backs the President of the United States in urging the immediate defeat of the McKellar bill, S. 575; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, to Vice President Henry A. Wallace, to Senator Alben W. Barkley, Senator Lister Hill, Senator Charles L. McNary, Senator Kenneth McKellar, and to the press.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 227. A bill for the relief of the Tours Apartment Hotel; without amendment (Rept. No. 105);

H. R. 535. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Donna Pittel; with an amendment (Rept. No. 106); and

S. 769. A bill for the reimbursement of civilian personnel of the United States Antarctic Service for the value of personal property lost during the expedition to the Antarctic; without amendment (Rept. No. 107).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 170. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of O. T. Travis; with an amendment (Rept. No. 108); and

H. R. 1153. A bill for the relief of Cordie Underwood and Wilbur Kea; with amendments (Rept. No. 109).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 251. A bill for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 111);

S. 516. A bill for the relief of The Nashville, Chattanooga and St. Louis Railway; without amendment (Rept. No. 112); and

H. R. 605. A bill for the relief of Shumate Investment Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 113).

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 815. A bill to amend section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to authorize renewal of expiring 5-year level premium term policies of those in active military or naval service and certain others outside the continental limits of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 110).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY—THE MILK INDUSTRY (REPT. NO. 114)

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, early this week a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, known as the food committee, reported on the hearings which had been held on the milk industry. Yesterday, I was instructed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to submit the report. I realize that there is not time to read it now or to give it the consideration which it should receive. Therefore, I ask consent to submit the report and request that it be printed as a report of the Senate and also printed in the RECORD.

I shall not at this time go into the matter at length, but at a more opportune time it is my purpose to discuss in some detail the work of this subcommittee which pertains to many phases of the problem of food production and distribution.

There being no objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the report was received, ordered to be printed and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Subcommittee on Agriculture and Forestry, known as the food committee, has completed hearings on the current situation of the milk industry.

The subcommittee has heard representatives concerned with the milk industry from widely separated regions, among them being several representatives of State milk-control boards charged with the duty of providing consumers with an adequate supply of milk at fair prices and also many representatives of producer organizations. Representatives of the Office of Price Administration, the Office of Economic Stabilization, and of the Department of Agriculture were also heard in regard to the policies of these Federal agencies relative to the milk industry.

This subcommittee realizing the vital importance of maintaining and increasing production of all dairy products to supply the armed forces, our allies, and our civilian population is anxious to expedite the industry's attempt to expand its production.

All witnesses representing State control boards and producer organizations testified that the ceiling recently placed upon producer prices would unless promptly modified result in drastically decreased production. Some witnesses testified that the ceiling prices placed milk values to the producer at less than cost of production; that many farmers had already been forced out of business and a large number of other producers were threatened with having to discontinue the production of milk.

The testimony indicated that dairy farmers were unable to compete for labor with the high-wage industries and that so many men had left their jobs with the dairymen that large numbers of herds were being liquidated either for beef or by disposal to other dairymen. Shortages and higher prices of feed and scarcity of farm machinery were also emphasized.

With such conditions prevailing in so vital an industry, immediate attention was demanded. Whereupon, this committee on February 19 brought together representatives of dairymen and the departments of Government responsible for regulations governing the industry so that a clearer understanding of the problems could be aired before a congressional committee.

Representatives of the executive agencies agreed that further consideration would be given the milk-price situation immediately and that where inequalities in price existed correction would be made. These representatives of the Office of Price Administration, Department of Agriculture, and the Office of Economic Stabilization did meet promptly to consider acute conditions existing in three New England markets and, as a result, an increase of one-half cent per quart to producers was recommended. It is understood that attention will be promptly given to conditions which exist in many other markets.

The small increase in price to New England producers will undoubtedly have its effect in retarding the rate at which milk production was decreasing, although it will not be as effective as it would have been if granted some months ago before many dairy farmers had disposed of their herds and had lost much of their labor. The long time which elapsed between the hearings on the application for a price adjustment on September 24, 1942, and the date of the tentative order on March 1, 1943, was undoubtedly a contributing factor to the reduction of milk production in these New England areas.

Indications are that unless cost of production can be reduced or at least held stationary and unless more labor is available to dairymen, the crisis in the industry will become stringently acute by the latter part of the summer.

While it is believed that, as a result of the hearings before this committee on February 17 and 19, a clearer understanding of the problems of both Government and milk producers now exists and that the rapidly accelerating decrease in milk production may be

slowed down, yet it will be advisable for this committee to hold hearings from time to time on the milk situation at which the problems of producers, distributors, consumers, and Government agencies may be currently discussed.

The committee recommends that in fixing price ceilings on fluid milk and other dairy products the importance of maintaining and, if possible, increasing production must be kept first in mind, that prices must be realized by the producer which will allow him to pay wages attractive enough to keep what labor is left and that sectional differences in cost of production including labor, feed, transportation, and all other elements of cost be borne in mind in fixing future ceilings.

We cannot emphasize too strongly the necessity for adjusting prices on dairy products at a level which will maintain production before shortages occur. Dairy production cannot be increased by the simple issuance of a new regulation. Shortages must be anticipated and forestalled for it requires 3 years to replace a dairy cow once she has been sold for beef.

Your subcommittee further noted an apparent lack of familiarity with certain problems of the dairy industry by some high Government officials. We recommend that in the future not only should the Department of Agriculture be freely consulted and advised by other agencies of Government in dealing with agricultural problems, but that representatives of the dairy industry itself be given an opportunity to be heard before such vital matters as price ceilings are decided upon.

It was made plain to the committee that except for hearings conducted by the Department of Agriculture, neither those who represent the dairy interests nor those charged with the protection of consumer interests were given an opportunity to be heard before the Nation-wide price ceiling was imposed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mrs. CARAWAY:

S. 869. A bill for the relief of Betty Ray Bell and Jess L. Bell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 870. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase food, clothing, supplies, and materials for resale to employees of the Department of the Interior stationed in Alaska; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 871. A bill for the relief of Harriet A. Richey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 872. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Frank T. Hines a brigadier general in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 873. A bill to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 874. A bill to require competitive bidding in connection with the sale of certain railroad securities; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 875. A bill to provide for the preparation of high-school students for wartime service; and

S. 876. A bill to provide for the wartime care and protection of children of employed mothers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NYE:

S. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution relating to Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and providing for the refund of all penalty taxes collected and for the cancellation of all uncollected penalty taxes on so-called excess wheat for the years 1941 and 1942; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2030) to permit the shipment tax-free of certain tobacco products to territories of the United States for the use of members of the military and naval forces of the United States was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

INVESTIGATION OF LABOR SHORTAGES IN CERTAIN WESTERN STATES—ASSIGNMENT OF GOVERNMENTAL REPRESENTATIVES TO ACCOMPANY SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 113), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, and the Director of Defense Transportation are each requested to assign a representative of their respective departments or agencies to accompany the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, appointed pursuant to Senate Resolution 88, Seventy-eighth Congress (relating to an investigation of the existing shortage of labor in the Pacific Coast and Rocky Mountain States and the effect of such shortage upon the war effort), to such places as may be necessary for the purpose of participating in such investigation and in hearings held in connection therewith.

The limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased by \$10,000.

COMMODITIES NEEDED IN THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there came to my desk today a number of letters from my farmer constituents telling about the serious situation in the State of Wisconsin. I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this place a letter which comes from Harvey Cornell, secretary of the mobilization committee of Sturgeon Bay, Wis.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF

SCHOOLS, DOOR COUNTY,

Sturgeon Bay, Wis., March 9 1943.

Mr. ALEXANDER WILEY,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

Hon. Mr. WILEY: This letter is to inform you of a meeting of the mobilization committee of Door County, Wis., held on the afternoon of March 8. The issues discussed at the meeting, which we feel you would like to be informed about, were chiefly as follows:

1. Feed dealers reported difficulty in getting high-protein feeds to take care of current needs. Special mention was made of soybean meal, gluten, and oil meal.

2. (a) Fruit packers reported needs for containers for juices if such are to be saved and processed for use.

(b) Picking pails or picking containers.

(c) Nitrogen fertilizers in larger quantities. Present supply slightly over one-half of needs.

(d) Jar caps and rubbers for home canning should be made available.

3. General farm groups expressed the following needs:

(a) Need to release more farm machinery for Door County. (Why hold machinery in stock in local warehouses when it is needed on the farms?) Special mention was made of cultivators, spring-tooth harrows, and plows. It was felt that it would be necessary to reallocate machinery to areas where most needed on short notice. Cases of bumper crops would call for greater supplies in certain areas immediately.

(b) Allotted machinery should be made available to the dealers in time for distribution and use.

(c) Need for early action to set ceiling price on sugar beets to insure planting on time.

(d) Step up priority to farmers. (Farmers find difficulty in getting needed fencing and other metallic materials.)

(e) Need to improve farm labor situation. Recommendations to make men 38 years of age or older available as farm help.

The committee feels that the above-mentioned factors are quite urgent and should receive Nation-wide attention at once.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM MOORE,
Chairman.

HARVEY CORNELL,
Secretary of Mobilization Committee.

ON DOUBLE-CROSSING

Mr. WILEY. I desire to have the attention of the Senate while I read an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post this morning. The title is "On Double-Crossing," and the editorial reads:

ON DOUBLE-CROSSING

Talk about the possibility of the United States double-crossing Russia has focused interest once more on a resolution of vital importance before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. There is only one situation that gives rise to charges of double-crossing on the part of the United States. That is the situation developing out of a deadlock between the President and Congress. Rejection of the League of Nations by the Senate after Woodrow Wilson had sponsored it at Paris is the classic example. Certainly those conflicting acts on the part of our Government gave millions of people the impression that the United States was guilty of a double-cross.

Chairman CONNALLY of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—

I am sorry the Senator from Texas is not in the Chamber at the moment—

Chairman CONNALLY, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, gave assurance the other day, following Vice President WALLACE's speech, that the United States is not going to double-cross Russia or any other nation. His assurance, so far as intentions are concerned, would doubtless be reiterated by every Member of Congress and every executive official. Yet there is nothing to prevent another deadlock between the President and Congress over the post-war settlement. And no steps of any importance are being taken to prevent such a tragedy.

I repeat those words, "And no steps of any importance are being taken to prevent such a tragedy."

The editorial continues:

The first step toward preventing a double-cross or even fear of another flip-flop of the 1919-20 variety is enactment of Senator

WILEY's resolution calling for a foreign relations advisory council. That body would be appointed by the President and would consist of the Secretary and Under Secretary of State, the chairmen and ranking minority Members of the Senate and House committees dealing with foreign affairs, experts of the Department of State and such additional Senators as the President might designate.

Mr. President, I may say that that is practically verbatim my resolution. I continue reading the editorial:

The whole purpose of the resolution is to bring about a meeting of minds between the executive and legislative branches as to the type of peace the United States should seek.

I now call attention to the following language of the editorial, which seems to me to have a direct bearing upon whether we are going backward to the old conditions or forward to some kind of a meeting of minds between the Executive and the Senate. We have been talking, and the country is full of such talk, of cooperating with foreign nations. I say that the first step in the plan of cooperation is to learn to cooperate with your own. If one cannot live with his own family, he is in a bad fix. If he cannot live with his own community, he is in the same condition. If one cannot get along with his own State, the result is the same. Certainly if the Senate and the Executive cannot, in this most critical hour, embrace the spirit of cooperation and collaboration which is necessary, we are missing the boat.

I want the Senate to pay particular attention to this language:

Conferences are soon to be held with other members of the United Nations on economic problems, food supplies, world reconstruction, freedom of the air, and so forth. Unquestionably Congress should have a part in the formulation of policies in these spheres. To ignore the Senate in matters of such vital importance to the future of the country would be to invite a revolt when treaties are sent to that body for ratification. How can we expect other governments to place any reliance upon any plans that might be evolved without either the cooperation or knowledge of Congress? The first elementary step toward discussion of the new world order is to bridge the gap between the White House and the Senate by some open acknowledgment of their partnership in this momentous undertaking.

Mr. President, the lackadaisical attitude of this body toward the one important feature which is stressed by the Washington Post, and which has been stressed by leading editorial writers of the country and by magazine writers, is tragic. Yet the Foreign Relations Committee apparently will give no consideration to the matter, simply because the Executive will not give the "green light." I say it is the obligation of the Senate to adopt the resolution, and put the matter squarely up to the Executive, and if he does not give the "green light" then let the ax fall where it will. If we do not take this step the responsibility is partially ours.

Yesterday we heard a magnificent speech made on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. He told in graphic language how we, the American people, feel. We want to accomplish something. But, Mr.

President, if we do not have the mechanics for the accomplishment we shall simply be lost in the maze of post-war problems. It seems to me this editorial should cause every Senator to recognize the significance of his position in the world situation.

AFTER VICTORY, WHAT?—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject After Victory, What? delivered by him on the animated magazine program at Rollins College on February 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE EDUCATOR AND HIS GOVERNMENT—ARTICLE BY FORMER SENATOR ROSIER

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Educator and His Government" by Hon. Joseph Rosier, formerly United States Senator from West Virginia, and president, State Teachers College, Fairmont, W. Va., which appears in the Appendix.]

RUSSIA AND THE WESTERN ALLIES—EDITORIAL BY ERNEST LINDLEY

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Russia and the Western Allies" written by Ernest Lindley and reprinted in the Washington (D. C.) Post of March 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEW DEAL POLITICS IN THE COURTS—EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO HERALD-AMERICAN

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "New Deal Politics in the Courts" published in the Chicago Herald-American of Tuesday, March 9, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1943

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1975) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The question is on the committee amendment on page 15, line 6.

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce" on page 15, after line 22, to insert:

WEATHER BUREAU

Observations, warnings, and general weather service: For an additional amount for observations, warnings, and general weather service, fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1943, \$390,000: *Provided*, That the limitation on the amount which may be expended for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia is hereby increased from \$900,880 to \$937,825.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior", on page 17, after line 3, to insert:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma: For continuation of construction, \$400,000 from the

general fund of the Treasury, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the total construction cost of all the features of the project not to exceed \$3,080,000 shall be reimbursable under the provisions of the reclamation law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Mines", page 17, after line 15, to strike out:

Investigation of bauxite and alunite ores and aluminum clay deposits (national defense): For an additional amount for investigation of bauxite and alunite ores and aluminum clay deposits, including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1943, and including the purchase of drilling rigs mounted on trucks and of auxiliary trucks to service drilling rigs without charge against the limitation on the purchase of motor-propelled vehicles hereinafter specified, \$325,000: *Provided*, That the limitation on the amounts which may be expended for purchase of motor-propelled vehicles, and available to the Geological Survey to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, are hereby increased from \$6,000 to \$18,000, and from \$80,000 to \$100,000, respectively.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Investigation of bauxite and alunite ores and aluminum clay deposits (national defense): For an additional amount for investigation of bauxite and alunite ores and aluminum clay deposits, including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1943, and including the purchase of drilling rigs mounted on trucks and of auxiliary trucks to service drilling rigs without charge against the limitation on the purchase of motor-propelled vehicles hereinafter specified, \$2,500,000, to remain available until June 30, 1944: *Provided*, That the limitation on the amount which may be expended for purchase of motor-propelled vehicles is hereby increased from \$6,000 to \$30,000; the limitation on the amount to be available to the Geological Survey is hereby increased from \$80,000 to \$300,000; and the limitation on the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia is hereby increased from \$38,000 to \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Justice—Office of the Attorney General", on page 20, line 7, after the word "dependent", to strike out "minor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Labor—Bureau of Labor Statistics", on page 21, line 9, after the numerals "1943", to strike out "\$12,300" and insert "\$89,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department—Office of the Secretary", on page 21, line 18, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 9 and"; and in line 20, after the word "Congress", to strike out "\$4,134.06" and insert "\$5,178.89."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona be good enough to make an explanation of the amendment on page 21, under the heading of Navy Department, providing an increase of funds for the Office of the Secretary of the Navy for settling claims for damages to private property arising from collisions with naval vessels? Is the mon-

ey provided for damages which have already been incurred?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. AIKEN. That is for collisions between naval vessels and private vessels?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is for payment of audited claims.

Mr. AIKEN. And the committee is satisfied that the settlements are in accordance with the provisions of existing law?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. This is the customary appropriation made after the claims for damages have been examined, approved, and audited. Then we appropriate money to pay the claims.

Mr. AIKEN. I was prompted to ask the question because of my knowledge that a great deal of our shipping is insured by the Maritime Commission for anywhere from 5 to 20 times its actual value, and I simply wanted to make sure that the Navy was not settling its claims on that basis.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; I never heard of anything like that.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is satisfied that the settlements provided are fair?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. That is all I wanted to know.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 21, line 18.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Coast Guard", on page 22, line 5, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 10 and", and in line 7, after the word "Congress", to strike out "\$1,586.79" and insert "\$1,656.79."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Post Office Department—(Out of the postal-revenues)", on page 22, after line 9, to insert:

DEPARTMENTAL

CONTINGENT EXPENSES

Printing and binding, Post Office Department: For an additional amount for printing and binding for the Post Office Department, fiscal year 1943, \$365,000.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like the Senator from Arizona to explain that amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. The amendment providing for printing and binding?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. It relates to the need for additional money for order blanks and other printing of that kind, due to an expansion of the business of the Post Office Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 14, to insert: "Field service."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of State", on page 25, after line 19, to insert:

Foreign Service, auxiliary (emergency): For an additional amount for Foreign Serv-

ice, auxiliary (emergency), Department of State, fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1943, \$491,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. By direction of the committee I offer as an amendment to the committee amendment, a proviso which was included in the bill by the House Committee on Appropriations, and went out on a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 25, line 24, in the committee amendment, after the figure "\$491,000", it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided*, That cost of living and representation allowances, as authorized by the act approved February 23, 1931, as amended, may be paid from this appropriation to American citizens employed hereunder."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I did not hear the remarks made by the Senator from Arizona in regard to that amendment. Will the Senator please explain it?

Mr. HAYDEN. As I explained to the Senate, the proviso which I am offering was reported from the House Committee on Appropriations, and went out on the floor of the House on a point of order. It provides that the cost of living and representation allowances, as authorized by the act of February 23, 1931, as amended, may be paid from this appropriation to American citizens employed hereunder. The inclusion of the provision was requested by the State Department.

Mr. McCARRAN. I understand. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Treasury Department—Office of Treasurer of the United States", on page 28, line 4, after the numerals "1943", to strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$163,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "War Department—Military Activities—Office of the Secretary of War", on page 28, line 29, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 11 and", and in line 21, after the word "Congress", to strike out "\$2,701.85" and insert "\$7,153.35."

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, are we considering the item under "Office of Treasurer of the United States"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the amendment now under consideration is under the heading of "War Department", on page 28, line 20.

Mr. HOLMAN. I request that the Senate revert to consideration of the item under "Office of Treasurer of the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment on page 28, line 4, was agreed to will be reconsidered.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the Senator from Arizona yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. At this time I should like to make of record two letters which I received yesterday from two separate Oregon newspapers, one being a copy of a letter from the editor of the Corvallis Gazette-Times addressed to a citizen who, I believe, has charge of propaganda for bond sales in Oregon. My purpose is to call attention at this time to preventable waste, both of funds and materials as well as of personal services. My contention is that personal services of those who are engaged in unessential work could with economy be transferred to necessary work, and thereby obviate the expense of additional appropriations for increased clerical hire. I read the letter from the editor of the Corvallis Gazette-Times, Corvallis, Oreg., under date of February 23:

MY DEAR MR. KUHN: I have been too busy opening Government propaganda mail to answer yours of the 17th any sooner. I studied your story sympathetically, but I could not see where it had any bearing on the local situation.

I appreciate your offer of help in case I need it, and I do need it very badly. I need the help of you and others in the war-bond organization to cut out 90 percent of the propaganda and expensive mats that come from the Treasury Department in reference to bond drives. If I get this stuff, I presume every other newspaper in the United States does also. I have never seen any of them printed. I notice by today's dispatches that a congressional investigation committee estimates that the Government will use 2,000,000,000 pounds of paper this year. That, I guess, would print all the newspapers on the Pacific coast. In addition, it takes thousands of stenographers, thousands of typewriters, and thousands of feet of office space to get the copy out and there is a scarcity of all three.

So I think the greatest help you could be would be to persuade the Treasury Department of the inadvisability of sending out so much expensive literature.

There is enclosed with the letter sent to me a number of exhibits which are just about on a par with the Victory magazine items which previously I have called to the attention of the Senate.

Then I have a letter addressed to me by the editor of the Bend Bulletin, Bend, Oreg., dated March 3, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR HOLMAN: As I have wired you I am satisfied that the measures that have been taken for reduced consumption of newsprint are sound and necessary. Printers, as you probably know, are also on reduced paper rations; and, while reductions may be necessary on the basis of the available supply of envelopes and fine papers, the reason for the shortage in those lines is, to a large extent, Government waste. If you could secure the elimination of such waste, you would be doing a real service.

As examples of waste, I call your attention to the material I enclose with this. Observe the size of the envelope in each case and the weight of paper from which the envelopes are made. Observe the size of the mailed piece in comparison with that of the envelope in each case. Observe the nature of the mailed piece and note that the Gamble

mat was received here 2 weeks after the news event it describes had happened.

At the same time let it be noted that our dealer tells us that Government demands make it impossible to fill certain printer orders.

Among the enclosures is a large envelope and, Senators, look what is in it. Something we have no use for at all. Then when we further examine what is in it we find something which is not worth printing.

Here is another large envelope, and in it are some more mats which were not used, and apparently are seldom used and, when, if ever, used, are of no practical purpose. Here is something else which is absolutely silly.

Mr. President, all I am trying to do is to let light into the dark places, in the hope that the responsible departmental officials will take cognizance of this matter and correct it. I make these observations also to be advised by the distinguished Senator from Arizona who is handling this bill, how, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, where I am endeavoring to bring about economies by means of percentage cuts in appropriations or otherwise to force departments to apply possible cuts in a practical and economical manner.

I thank the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] for permitting this interruption, and I should like his comments on where to apply a percentage cut to effect reduction in this waste of manpower, funds, and material.

It will be recalled that when a million-dollar appropriation for the Treasury Department was before us a week or so ago our committee, upon my motion, made a straight cut of 25 percent, which was sustained by the Senate. It is now in conference. The Department came right back and asked that the cut be eliminated; therefore, the cut is eliminated, except for a certain reduction in it which was recommended by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the letter of the constituent of the Senator from Oregon mentioned a congressional committee which looked into waste in printing. That committee was the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. I mentioned the matter to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who told me that the Treasury Department has authority under the law to spend 1 percent of its income from bonds on advertising the sale of future issues of bonds. That is where the money to which the Senator refers comes from. The committee recommended that there be greater economy, which is entirely proper. I am at a loss to know just how to get at it at the moment unless we cut down the percentage allowed for advertising in order to promote the sale of United States bonds.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. An appropriation is also made for the purpose of advertising the sale of bonds, and that item is now before the Treasury Department subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. I have often felt, as does the

Senator from Oregon, that we are a little more lavish than necessary in advertising bond issues. I think there is sufficient enthusiasm and belief in the cause to make unnecessary large appropriations for advertising. Appropriations like the one he described should be unnecessary at any time. However, the place to make an effort to reduce such expenditures is in connection with the Treasury-Post Office appropriation.

Mr. HOLMAN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 28, line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 28, line 20.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the remainder of the amendments in the bill relate to judgments and audited claims. I ask that they be agreed to en bloc, and that we then proceed on page 51 with the remaining committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall not object, but I should like to know what is going on. The clerk is reading so fast that I cannot understand him. I do not know the reason for the hurry to pass this bill all of a sudden. I think that as a matter of proper procedure the clerk should read more slowly so that the Senate may understand what is going on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the heading "Title II. Judgments and authorized claims—property damage claims", on page 31, after line 6, to insert:

(b) For the payment of claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the following respective departments and independent offices, under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in the sums not exceeding \$1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922 (31 U. S. C. 215), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 15, Seventy-eighth Congress, as follows:

Office for Emergency Management, \$31.45;
Petroleum Administration for War, \$65.90;
Federal Security Agency, \$212.46;
Federal Works Agency, \$650.35;
Department of Agriculture, \$450;
Department of the Interior, \$1,138.68;
Navy Department, \$2,453.73;
War Department, \$47,914.79;
In all, \$52,917.36.

Under the subhead "Judgments, United States courts", on page 33, after line 3, to insert:

(c) For the payment of the judgment, which has been rendered under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," as amended by section 297 of the act of March 3,

1911 (28 U. S. C. 761), and which has been certified to the Seventy-eighth Congress in Senate Document No. 14 under the War Department, \$525.35, together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay interest as provided by law.

On page 33, at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)."

On page 33, at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "(d)" and insert "(e)."

Under the subhead "Judgments, United States Court of Claims", on page 33, line 24, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 12 and"; on page 34, at the end of line 4, to increase the appropriation for Public Buildings Administration from \$71,493.06 to \$103,891.37; after line 8, to insert "Commerce Department, \$1,636.12"; at the end of line 11, to increase the appropriation for the Navy Department from \$36,606.09 to \$37,855.45; in line 12, after the word "Department", to strike out "out of the postal revenues"; and in line 16, after the words "In all", to strike out "\$702,684.86" and insert "\$737,968.65."

Under the subhead "Audited claims", on page 45, after line 15, to insert:

(b) For the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the General Accounting Office under appropriations the balances of which have been carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (31 U. S. C. 713), and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1940 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (5 U. S. C. 266), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, there is appropriated as follows:

Independent offices: For administrative expenses, United States Housing Authority, Federal Public Housing Authority, \$12.30.

For general administrative expenses, Public Buildings Administration, \$7.84.

For salaries and expenses, Veterans' Administration, \$21.70.

Department of Agriculture: For salaries and expenses, library, Department of Agriculture, \$6.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry, \$462.80.

For National Industrial Recovery, Resettlement Administration, submarginal lands (transfer to Agriculture), \$12.65.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Plant Industry, \$1.36.

For salaries and expenses, Soil Conservation Service, \$82.50.

For salaries and expenses, Forest Service, \$508.76.

For acquisition of lands for protection of watersheds of navigable streams, \$52.

For exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Department of Agriculture (transfer to Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, act June 28, 1937), \$63.81.

For exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Department of Agriculture (transfer to Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation), \$3,120.74.

For conservation and use of agricultural land resources, Department of Agriculture, \$226.40.

For submarginal land program, Farm Tenant Act, Department of Agriculture, \$2,189.

For land utilization and retirement of submarginal land, Department of Agriculture, \$1,468.90.

Department of Commerce: For Civil Aeronautics Authority fund, \$2,686.95.

For establishment of air-navigation facilities, Civil Aeronautics Authority, \$250.

For salaries and expenses, Air Safety Board, Civil Aeronautics Authority, \$2.48.

For salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Authority, \$8.92.

Department of the Interior: For conservation of health among Indians, \$80.

For Indian school support, \$52.35.

Department of Justice: For miscellaneous expenses, United States courts (transfer to Justice), \$16.25.

For salaries and expenses, Federal Bureau of Investigation, \$14.35.

For salaries and expenses of marshals, and so forth, Department of Justice, \$45.52.

The Judiciary: For fees and expenses of conciliation commissioners, United States courts, \$25.

For miscellaneous expenses, United States courts, \$7.71.

Department of Labor: For salaries and expenses, Division of Labor Standards, Department of Labor, \$20.44.

Navy Department: For general expenses, Marine Corps, \$172.09.

For pay, Marine Corps, \$376.42.

For ordnance and ordnance stores, Bureau of Ordnance, \$2,358.

For ordnance and ordnance stores, Navy, \$97,097.

For construction and repair, Navy, \$147.30.

For maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, \$2,838.99.

For aviation, Navy, \$178,420.27.

For pay and allowances, Coast Guard, \$280.

For pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy, \$6,449.88.

Department of State: For salaries, Foreign Service officers, \$120.

For transportation, Foreign Service, \$868.10.

Treasury Department: For collecting the revenue from customs, \$19.92.

For contingent expenses, public moneys, \$35.95.

For collecting the internal revenue, \$4.35.

War Department: For general appropriations, Quartermaster Corps, \$21.80.

For working fund, War, ordnance, \$17.62.

For Civilian Conservation Corps (transfer to War), \$625.97.

For emergency conservation work (transfer to War, Act June 22, 1936), \$4.66.

Post Office Department—Postal Service (out of the postal revenues): For transportation of equipment and supplies, \$6.28.

On page 49, after line 14, to insert:

Total, audited claims, section 204 (b), \$302,011.33, together with such additional sum due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in the foreign currency and interest as specified in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office.

On page 50, line 5, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 13 and", and in line 6, after the numerals "80", to strike out "\$12,275.42" and insert "\$13,491.40."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee following the amendments agreed to en bloc.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—General Provisions", on page 51, after line 13, to strike out:

SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation contained in this act or authorized hereby to be expended (except as otherwise provided for herein) shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States, whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person is a citizen of the United States, or a person in the service of the United States on the date of the approval of this act who being eligible for citizenship had theretofore filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen or who owes alle-

giance to the United States. This section shall not apply to citizens of the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 303. Except as otherwise provided for in this act, no part of any appropriation contained in or authorized to be expended by this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this act who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date, or (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his status have been complied with. The provisions of this section shall not apply to citizens of the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I am not certain that I heard the clerk distinctly, but I thought he was referring to page 51. Am I correct in my understanding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. On page 51 appears the language to be stricken out, and on page 52 is the language to be inserted in lieu of that stricken out on page 51.

Mr. DANAHER. What became of the amendment on page 33, lines 4 to 12, inclusive?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment was agreed to at the request of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. It is one of the amendments agreed to en bloc.

Mr. HAYDEN. I asked that the audited claims be agreed to en bloc.

Mr. DANAHER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 51, after line 13.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, Senators will remember that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] has been very much interested in legislation of this character. It was he who proposed this change. The effect of the change is shown in lines 11 and 12, on page 52:

For the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his status have been complied with.

Under existing law such a person cannot be paid until there is positive proof that he is a citizen. The General Accounting Office states that it is impossible to administer such a law, whereas if a man makes an affidavit that he is a citizen, and he is not a citizen, he can be prosecuted for perjury. The amendment would make it possible to meet pay rolls on time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 51, after line 13.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 52, after line 16, to insert:

SEC. 304. No part of the funds appropriated in this act shall be expended for the payment of any per diem compensation, except for artisans and craftsmen, unless, prior to the employment of any person on a per diem basis, the head of the Department or agency for which an appropriation is made shall certify to the Bureau of the Budget that such per diem employment is necessary for services which cannot be obtained under the civil-service laws: *Provided*, That prior to July 1, 1943, and quarterly thereafter, a report shall be made to the Congress by the head of every Department or agency for which funds are herein appropriated, listing the names of all per diem employees, the amounts paid to every such person, and the nature and character of all outside employment of such persons.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this amendment was suggested by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. It relates to per diem employment, about which there has been great complaint. It would have the effect, first, of requiring that before a person is employed on a per diem basis the head of the department or agency requiring the employee shall certify to the Bureau of the Budget that such per diem employment is necessary. Secondly, there is also the requirement that reports be made periodically to Congress as to those who have been employed on a per diem basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 52, after line 16.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, at the beginning of line 6, to change the section number from "304" to "305."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to return to page 31 of the bill and offer an amendment on behalf of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 31, line 1, after the words "Navy Department", it is proposed to strike out "\$8,330.02" and insert in lieu thereof "\$8,113.97"; and in line 6, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$73,094.37" and insert in lieu thereof "\$72,828."

Mr. HAYDEN. It seems that in adding up the total the same claim was counted twice, and the purpose of the amendment is to correct the total.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the committee I offer another amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may offer an amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have been directed by the committee to offer certain amendments on behalf of the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator wish to have those amendments considered first?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, after line 1, it is proposed to insert the following:

BOARD OF INVESTIGATION AND RESEARCH—
TRANSPORTATION

Notwithstanding the limitations in section 203 of the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, the appropriation for the Board of Investigation and Research contained in said act shall be available for travel expenses and printing and binding in amounts not exceeding \$11,000 and \$23,000, respectively.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, Senators familiar with the matter will remember that the appropriation made for this agency in the regular appropriation bill was conditioned upon the understanding that the agency would wind up its business completely by June 30 of 1943. It has been asserted that in order to do so the agency needs the proposed increase in printing and travel allowances. It has indicated that it will close up its business. For that reason, the committee was willing to increase the limitation, which does not increase the appropriation in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 28, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

Special melting and coinage: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out the provisions of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to further the war effort by authorizing the substitution of other materials for strategic metals used in minor coinage, to authorize the forming of worn and uncurrent standard silver dollars into bars, and for other purposes," approved December 18, 1942 (Public Law 815), the expenses or adjustments in connection with the forming of worn and uncurrent standard silver dollars into bars shall be charged against the gain arising from the coinage of such bars.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I do not understand the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I was about to explain it.

On December 18, 1942, Congress passed an act authorizing the melting down and recoinage of practically \$50,000,000 worth of worn and damaged silver dollars in the Treasury. Due to handling and being carried around in pockets, clips, and otherwise, there is estimated to be a loss of about \$4,000,000 in the value of \$50,000,000 in silver dollars, on the basis of \$1.29 an ounce. A budget estimate was submitted to appropriate \$4,000,000 to balance the books

of the Treasury by reason of the loss of silver in the dollar when it is melted down. At the same time, it is proposed to take the identical silver and coin it into half dollars, quarters, and dimes. The ratio at which a dollar is coined is \$1.29 an ounce. The ratio at which the minor coins are coined is \$1.38 an ounce. So what is lost in melting down the dollar is regained on the books of the Treasury when the minor coins are issued.

Therefore, instead of appropriating \$4,000,000 to balance the books, we simply provide that whatever may be lost in melting down the dollars shall be recouped by the credit which will be placed on the books of the Treasury when the dollars are recoinced into minor coins. The dollars have become badly worn, and, of course, in that way there has been a loss of some of the silver. The effect of the amendment will be to provide needed storage space; also, in the process of recoincing, there will be recovered approximately 400,000 pounds of copper which now is contained in the alloy used in coining the dollars. Of course, copper is greatly needed in the war effort.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. As a matter of fact, the loss would be only a paper loss, anyway, so far as the books of the Treasury are concerned; would it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the thought which occurred to the committee. Obviously, there is no sense in appropriating \$4,000,000 in order to make up a paper loss.

Mr. DANAHER. So the paper loss would simply be charged off against the paper profit; is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct; that is what the amendment would do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona on behalf of the committee, on page 28, after line 8.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, after line 17, it is proposed to insert the following:

Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services: For payments to States for expenditure in accordance with State plans for the wartime care and protection of children of employed mothers, approved by the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services, upon recommendation of the Children's Bureau, Department of Labor, or Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, and for payments to subdivisions of States for expenditure in accordance with such plans, such payments to be made by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with certification to him by any office of the Government designated for such purpose by the Director of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services, fiscal year 1943, \$2,894,000: *Provided*, That any plan so approved shall itemize by classes and amounts the total funds required for the plan and the

amount of Federal funds requested; shall provide for such methods of administration as are necessary for the efficient operation of the plan; shall set out a schedule of fees to be charged; shall state the extent of State and local participation in providing necessary funds, facilities, and services; shall provide for the inclusion and financing of any projects for care of children of employed mothers, now financed in whole or in part from Federal funds, upon the expiration of existing Federal grants, when such projects are essential to the prosecution of the war; and the Director of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services shall not approve any plan except upon his determination that the schedule of fees is the maximum practicable in view of the wages paid in the areas served, and his determination that the State and local participation is adequate in view of the financial status of the State or subdivisions: *Provided further*, That payments shall not exceed 50 percent of the total estimated expenditures, including expenditures from fees received, but excluding expenditures for purchase, renovation, construction, repair, or equipment of any building or premises in excess of \$1,000 for each project: *Provided further*, That no payment from this appropriation shall be available for the purchase or erection of buildings; for alteration, repair, and equipment for any single project in excess of \$1,000; or for operating expense, alteration, repairs, or equipment except in areas with special needs because of substantial increase in employment of women arising out of the war: *Provided further*, That the term "States" as used herein shall include the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii: *Provided further*, That any equipment which is under the control of the Federal Works Agency and which is necessary to a project for the care of children of employed mothers already in operation and in use at the time such project is placed under this program may be transferred for the purposes hereof to other Federal agencies as the Director of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services may prescribe, and the appraised value thereof shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

For all necessary expenses of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services, and other Federal agencies upon transfer thereto in accordance herewith, in connection with the foregoing approval of plans and payments to States including personal services in the District of Columbia; actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, without other compensation from the United States, while away from their homes in an advisory capacity to the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services; and printing and binding; fiscal year 1943, \$89,000: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any purchase from this appropriation when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$100.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. The amendment plainly collides with the rule prohibiting legislation on an appropriation bill. I should want to have the rule observed. The amendment is a very long and unusual one. I really was not able to understand it when it was read hastily by the clerk. Therefore, I invoke the rule, unless notice to suspend the rule has been given.

Mr. HAYDEN. I gave notice, and moved to suspend the rule so as to make it possible to agree to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona moved to suspend the rule.

Mr. McNARY. Let me inquire when the notice of motion to suspend the rule was given.

Mr. HAYDEN. I filed it on Monday.

Mr. McNARY. Was it in writing?

Mr. HAYDEN. It was in writing, and was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On March 9.

Mr. McNARY. Was it given by the acting chairman of the committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. By direction of the committee.

Mr. McNARY. Why was not the amendment included in the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. Because obviously it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. McNARY. It was not in the House bill; was it?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. If the Senator will permit me to tell him why it was not in the House bill, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. McNARY. Very well; certainly I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. HAYDEN. There are now employed in industry more than 1,000,000 women. We are told that there will be need in industrial work for more than 3,000,000 persons during the present year. The Army will take from industry approximately 1,300,000 persons, and approximately 1,800,000 more are needed in order to carry on the war work. The only reservoir left in the United States is that made up of the women. Workers can no longer be taken off the farms, or at least they should not be taken. We cannot employ women in factories in large numbers, particularly women who have children—and 1 out of 8 or 10 has children—unless they know that some care is being taken of their children. It is necessary to provide care not only for children of nursery-school age, but for school children. If the mother goes to work some time before the school opens, and if she leaves her work some time after the school closes, of course it is necessary that some care be provided for her child. Some of the funds covered by the amendment contemplate providing care around the schools for children, both before the opening of school and after the closing of school, so that the mother will know that someone is looking after her children, and that they are not roaming the streets. Everyone agrees that if a large number of women are to be employed in factories, it is absolutely necessary that some kind of care of the kind suggested in the amendment be provided for children.

There is an argument as to who is to provide the care. That is where the controversy arises in connection with the amendment.

During the operations of the Work Projects Administration many poor women who needed work were given work by the W. P. A., and other women were employed to care for the children while the mothers were at work. So under the W. P. A. there was an agency which did look after children. Now the W. P. A.

has been liquidated, except for its activities relating to providing care for children. Everything else was supposed to be wound up and disposed of on the 1st of February. But it is seeking to perpetuate itself by undertaking the extension of its work, not for poor women, not as a charity, but for women who, being employed in factories, need to have their children cared for.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. Let me ask whether the money about which the Senator speaks comes entirely under the appropriation for this purpose?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. BUCK. Has any money ever before been appropriated for the purpose?

Mr. HAYDEN. There have been allocations for the purpose from the President's funds, and also allocations from the W. P. A.; but Congress has not acted upon the matter before.

Mr. BUCK. The reason I ask the question is that in my State I have already seen notice of an allocation which has been made for the purpose.

Mr. HAYDEN. It has been made out of a lump-sum appropriated for use by the President, to carry on the work until such time as Congress might act.

Mr. BUCK. How much money does the President have to use in any way he may choose?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the last appropriation we made was approximately \$100,000,000.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me ask whether I am to understand from the explanation which has been given that the money proposed to be appropriated is to go to the W. P. A.?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, not if my amendment is agreed to. I was endeavoring to point out that two agencies of government are now engaged in the same kind of work, and there is a struggle as to which agency shall control it.

The other agency is the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services. That agency is headed by Mr. Charles P. Taft, the brother of our distinguished senior Senator from Ohio. The W. P. A. agency is headed by Miss Florence Kerr.

Mr. WALSH. Was this amendment discussed by the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. HAYDEN. It was.

Mr. WALSH. Was it agreed to by the committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. It was favorably reported to the Senate; yes, the committee agreed to it.

Mr. WALSH. Is it a fact that if the Congress should not adopt the amendment, the President, out of his fund, could use this amount of money for the purpose that is indicated?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to know what was the inquiry of the able Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. WALSH. I asked if the amendment had been discussed by the members of the Committee on Appropriations. The Senator from Arizona said it had

been. I understood him to say that they unanimously approved it.

Mr. HAYDEN. They recommended it to the Senate?

Mr. WALSH. I asked, even if the Congress did not act favorably upon this amendment, would existing law permit the President, out of the fund of \$100,000,000, which has been referred to, to use some of that money for this purpose?

Mr. HAYDEN. The President up to now has allocated money for the purpose.

Mr. WALSH. Can he continue to do it?

Mr. HAYDEN. If I were the President, I should want the Congress to pass upon the question one way or the other. That is the way I think it should be handled. It would be entirely proper for the President to allocate the money in a temporary manner, but when he submits a Budget estimate, and Congress acts or fails to act on it, then allotments from the fund will, of course, cease.

Mr. WALSH. What the Committee on Appropriations is seeking to do is to have Congress confirm the use of the money the President now has for this purpose.

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee want it done in one way or the other. It is work that must be done. I want to impress that upon the Senate. It is impossible to get women in large numbers to work in industry unless their children are taken care of. The question is what agency of the Government shall take care of the children. I was proceeding to point out what the W. P. A., or a remnant of it, has been doing along this line.

According to the testimony before the House Committee on Appropriations, the W. P. A. now has activities of this character in 27 communities consisting of 260 units, and they are taking care of 9,605 children. They have a program for increasing that number to 22,000 children. They say they have the applications on hand and can do that much.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. GERRY. How many States would this program cover?

Mr. HAYDEN. I cannot say. I simply have these figures. I am quite sure that there is one of these projects in the Senator's State.

Mr. GERRY. We are looking out for my State. How much has been spent on this work from the President's fund?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not know whether Mr. Johnstone, who is general counsel of the Federal Works Agency, testified as to that, but he did testify:

We have at the moment 260 units in 27 communities throughout the country. We started rather in a modest way. The amount of the funds that we put into it, Mr. TABER, is very modest. I do not know exactly, but I would guess it is between one and one-half and two million dollars on an annual basis.

That is the amount the W. P. A. has expended.

Mr. GERRY. I should like to ask the Senator another question. I understand the amount to be appropriated is \$2,884,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. GERRY. That is to start the work. The Federal Government pays up to 50 percent, and there is a rather complicated formula by which it is determined how much the State will pay and how much the Federal Government will pay.

Mr. HAYDEN. The women we are now benefiting are drawing good wages. The testimony before the committee is that they are not seeking charity; they are perfectly willing to pay for the care of their children. In some instances, where a mother has four or five children, it may be too great a burden on her; but we insist that the mothers pay half of the cost—they can do more than that if they want to, but there is a direction that they must contribute to the care of their children.

Mr. GERRY. I do not think the Senator quite caught what I had in mind. Under the amendment very wide powers are granted to the Director of Defense Health and Welfare Services. As I understand, he may determine what amount a State shall pay. Let me read from the amendment:

Provided, That any plan so approved shall itemize by classes and amounts the total funds required for the plan and the amount of Federal funds requested; shall provide for such methods of administration as are necessary for the efficient operation of the plan; shall set out a schedule of fees to be charged; shall state the extent of State and local participation in providing necessary funds, facilities, and services—

Reading further, beginning in line 17:

And the Director of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services shall not approve any plan except upon his determination that the schedule of fees is the maximum practicable in view of the wages paid in the area served—

Mr. HAYDEN. That is, I think, if a woman is making good wages.

Mr. GERRY. It does not say that; that means the Director could cut down the sums paid the State.

Mr. HAYDEN. Under the plan, in communities where women are making certain rates of wages there is fixed a minimum which they must pay for the care of their children. The amount may vary in different States and different communities within a State.

If I may proceed, I should like to explain the basis of difference between the two methods without discussing the merits of one or the other for the moment.

One agency, the W. P. A., is engaged in this activity and has spent between a million and a half and two million dollars, and has a number of projects under way, and has applications for an additional number. The other agency—

Mr. BYRD. Before the Senator leaves that point, the W. P. A. is still continued until, I think, about July 1. Will not this proposal result in duplicating what the W. P. A. is already doing?

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator will let me, I am trying to point out that there is a duplication now, and we are trying to get one agency or the other out of business.

Mr. BYRD. Let me ask a further question. This appropriation of \$2,884,000 is a deficiency appropriation, is it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is to carry on the work from now until the 30th of June.

Mr. BYRD. The W. P. A. will continue to do the same work until the 30th of June because the W. P. A. does not expire until the 30th of June.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the President's order attempts to liquidate the W. P. A. on the first of April.

Mr. BYRD. He may have attempted to do it, but the Administrator, when he was before the Economy Committee, said he could not liquidate on May 30 and had no intention of doing so. This deficiency appropriation will duplicate the work.

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course, there is duplication; that is what I am trying to point out to the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. Will this stop the duplication?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, it will. On page 3 of the amendment it is provided:

That any equipment which is under the control of the Federal Works Agency and which is necessary to a project for the care of children of employed mothers already in operation and in use at the time such project is placed under this program may be transferred for the purposes hereof to other Federal agencies as the Director of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services may prescribe, and the appraised value thereof shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Will this provision require enabling legislation by the States before they can get a share of the funds?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. LUCAS. I understood that it would, and I was very much interested in that.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is not so. I will explain the plan.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President—

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me tell the story myself; I should like to proceed for a moment.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. HAYDEN. Very well.

Mr. DANAHER. Is this not a program which depends upon a 50-percent matching by the States?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, how can the answer to the Senator from Illinois be other than that it would require legislation by the States?

Mr. HAYDEN. Matching can be made by the women who put their children under care; that is where the matching is done. It is done by the woman who is earning good pay by putting up half the cost.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Is it not true that the industrial plants, as a rule, pay the other 50 percent? In most instances the mothers of the children do not pay it. The plants where the work is being done pay

it, and that is included in the cost of the contract they are performing for the Government in the particular case. So the Government is paying the whole amount.

Mr. HAYDEN. My information is that is not true in the majority of instances.

Mr. BYRD. The report says that plants put up a part of the money.

Mr. HAYDEN. In some instances but not in all instances.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President—

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the Senator please let me tell the other side of the story and not interrupt for a moment? The Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services was given this work after a hearing before the Bureau of the Budget to determine how the duplication could be avoided. They started last fall with an allocation from the President's fund of \$400,000. Now it is proposed that the Federal agency and the State welfare agencies shall work under a cooperative plan. There is no duplication of the State welfare agencies and there is no duplication of the Federal agency, because we will abolish this function of the W. P. A. That is the normal way in which the matter should be handled, it seems to me, because we are not setting up a Federal agency to go down to the State level. The W. P. A. is down to the State level and is competing with the State agency. I think that is not as good a system as it is to utilize existing State welfare agencies for this purpose. They have been in existence; they understand the problem in their States. The health and welfare organizations in the States ought to be able to take care of it. If we do it the other way the W. P. A., as a Federal agency, simply steps into a community and does the work which the State agencies should do. That is why I say what we now recommend is a better plan, and that is what the Bureau of the Budget thought. The two ideas were presented to the Bureau of the Budget; this amount of money was submitted to Congress in a Budget estimate; and we are proposing to appropriate the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for a project which it believes to be the best in order to avoid duplication. If nothing is done by either agency, then the children of working women will not be cared for. I do not know how to proceed except to follow the Budget recommendation, as we have done here.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question so as to clear up two or three points?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that the W. P. A. has been performing this service for about 90,000 children up to this time?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; the statement in the House hearings by Mr. Johnstone, the counsel, was that they had in existence at that time 28 projects, in 260 units, more than 1 unit in a town, I take it, and they were caring for 9,605 children, that in 62 communities there were 546 applications to care for 22,000 children.

Mr. AIKEN. Over how long a period have they been caring for 9,000 children?

Mr. HAYDEN. It started last year, when women began to go into the factories.

Mr. AIKEN. And they had an allocation of \$400,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. AIKEN. What was the allocation?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Defense Health and Welfare Services had an allotment of \$400,000. They have spent out of some funds available to W. P. A., according to Mr. Johnstone, about a million and a half dollars. The Bureau of the Budget recommended that the W. P. A. fold up and turn over whatever it was doing to the Defense Health and Welfare Services, and that the matter be handled by one Federal agency, in cooperation with the State welfare agencies.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know whether that recommendation was made because of the plan to abolish the W. P. A.?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think that had something to do with it, but primarily it was to avoid duplication of effort by two Federal agencies. I am not here as a partisan of one agency or another; I am merely reporting to the Senate that the Bureau of the Budget, having heard the arguments between these two agencies as to which should handle this activity, recommended that it be turned over to the Defense Health and Welfare Services, and that anything the Federal Works Agency was doing be transferred to that agency, that it be consolidated in one office, and handled under one management. We could handle it the other way. We could say that whatever work along this line the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services has undertaken should be turned over to the W. P. A. Certainly we should not have two agencies operating in the same field.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator as to that. As I understand, the mothers who are working will be expected to pay approximately one-half the cost.

Mr. HAYDEN. In many instances they pay more than half. Mr. Charles P. Taft, testifying before the committee, said that the universal expression of the working women was, "We do not want charity. We are earning money, and we are willing to pay for the care of our children, and there is no difficulty about it." They resent the idea that this is to be a charity enterprise. On the other hand, there is a limit to what they can pay. If they should take care of half the cost, they would take care of the out-of-pocket cost to the Government. But that would not take care of the overhead, and that is what we have to provide for.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Government is to put up nearly \$3,000,000, that amounts to about \$100 a month per child for looking after the children while the mothers are working. I am figuring on \$2,884,000, which amounts to about \$130 each, as the Government's share for a 3 months' period.

Mr. HAYDEN. According to Mr. Taft's testimony, there are about 350,000 children now in need of care.

Mr. AIKEN. Then it is expected to care for many more than the 22,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes; it is proposed to care for not only those the W. P. A. has on hand but to take care of about 350,000 children scattered over the United States, whose mothers are working in factories.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What method of care is contemplated? Is it to be in an institution, or is it to be in the homes?

Mr. HAYDEN. One kind of care, which I have already mentioned, is for school children, from the time the mother leaves home for work until school opens, to the time she returns. There are nurseries and other types of places where the children can be cared for, where older women of the community may be employed to help.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to ask for a little more information. The Senator says we should not have duplication of services, which is very true, we should not have two departments of the Government undertaking to operate the same activity. Yet the proposed amendment requires that five departments of the Government work together in performing this one function. There is the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services, but they have to have the recommendation of the Children's Bureau, the Department of Labor, the Office of Education, and the Federal Security Agency.

Mr. HAYDEN. If I can find Mr. Taft's testimony, I should like to read it.

Mr. WALSH. In enumerating these agencies, was the Senator from Vermont reading from the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. From the amendment. I am wondering why the Defense Health and Welfare Services and four other agencies of the Government should be called upon. It seems to me that would confuse the matter much more than to have two agencies handling it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me read Mr. Taft's testimony, which I think very clearly indicates the principle involved. I read from Mr. Taft's testimony:

FUNCTION OF OFFICE OF DEFENSE HEALTH AND WELFARE SERVICES IS TO CERTIFY NEED

Mr. Taft. I raised the question as to how we are in this. We are in it because the President is required, under the Lanham Act, to pass on the need, and he has required the Federal Works Agency from the beginning to get a certificate from our agencies, as the technical service agencies—that is, the Public Health Service, the Office of Education, the Children's Bureau, and the Recreation Section—as to that need. They generally have also given a certificate as to the kind of facility to meet the need, and the President hasn't approved any projects without that certificate.

These are all recognized service agencies of the Government—

The agencies the Senator just mentioned—

and construction is not our job. Although we are concerned with the details of it to some extent, we aren't butting in but are just doing our job.

CHILDREN'S BUREAU DEALS WITH CHILD WELFARE AND MATERNITY PROBLEMS

Who, by authority of Congress, deals with the States on child welfare and maternal and child health? The Children's Bureau, which is not a construction agency.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION DEALS WITH EDUCATION AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING

Who, by authority of Congress, deals with the States on education and vocational training? That is the Office of Education, for which there is \$10,000,000 in this bill which has been approved up to date—and this is not a construction agency.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE DEALS WITH HEALTH PROBLEMS

The Public Health Service deals with health; Congress has authorized them to do that, and it is not a construction agency.

Now he describes his own office:

OFFICE OF DEFENSE HEALTH AND WELFARE SERVICES ACTS AS COORDINATOR

The Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services is simply the coordinator where more than one agency comes in, as here, and is the war end of the Federal Security Agency—and is nothing funny, or strange, or different than the wartime side of the Federal Security Agency. We stop when the war ends.

That is the whole purpose. If there is a question involving children, it is entirely proper that the Children's Bureau should handle it. If it is a question involving schools, the Office of Education should be consulted, and so on.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. REED. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and of the subcommittee which held the hearings on the pending bill, and I desire to tell the Senate of the increasing need for provision of the kind we are discussing.

Outside my home town in Kansas is a shell-loading plant, which has been in operation a little less than 1 year. There are engaged in the operations in that plant about 5,500 employees. When I was home, about 6 weeks ago, I made my usual trip to the plant for conference with the management. I was informed that at this time 40 percent of the employees in that shell-loading plant are women, and that the number is increasing. A year ago, of course, there were not any women in the plant, but there are now over 2,000 women employed there. They are not all women with children, and therefore are not all interested in the matter we are discussing, but the management also told me that with women employees they had less trouble insofar as discipline and absenteeism are concerned, and it was the intention of the management to increase the number of women employed there as rapidly as additional women are available for work in the plant, on the character of jobs they can handle, and that some time this year probably 60 percent of the total number of employees in the plant will be women.

As I have stated, I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and I am not wholly happy or satisfied that the method now suggested should be permanently established as the best way to handle the matter, but in the absence of any better authority, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and of the subcommittee dealing with this subject, I am willing, for the purposes of the pending bill, to take the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget as to how to proceed.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator. Are there any further questions?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I just made the statement that in many instances the plants in which the women were employed would pay half the cost of the care of the children. This is the testimony of Mr. Taft:

Let me suggest that to a certain degree the Federal Government is going to pay it anyway, because at quite a number of these plants, and it will become an increasing number, beyond any question, if these services are not provided in the community, the plants will provide their own day nurseries which will be charged in on their costs and collected on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis. They are doing it now.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. The point I desire to make is that under the terms of the amendment the 50 percent which the Government puts up could be matched by the plants, and in that event it would be added into the cost of the contracts the plants have with the Government, so the Government would be putting up 100 percent.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then what difference does it make whether we appropriate it or it is paid by the plant? It would all come out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. BYRD. I did not say that. I said Mr. Taft stated some of the plants are doing this. If it is on a 50 percent basis, it seems to me there should be some provision whereby the mothers should be required to pay something. They are all making high wages.

Mr. HAYDEN. All I can tell the Senator about it is that Mr. Taft's testimony was that they wanted to pay; they do not want charity.

Mr. BYRD. Would the Senator object to an amendment to require the mothers to pay some reasonable part of the cost of taking care of their own children when they are working for big wages for the Government? Is there anything unreasonable about that?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the expectation.

Mr. BYRD. Many expectations are not carried out, as the Senator well knows, when bureaus take charge of the expenditure of money. What would be unreasonable or unfair in requiring that when a mother is making big wages, paid by the Government, she should pay a certain percentage of the cost of the care of her children?

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator will prepare an amendment, I shall be glad to take it to conference.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to ask the Senator about an amendment I am about to propose to the amendment on page 1, line 6, after the word "Labor", to strike out "or Office of Education, Federal Security Agency."

What would the Senator think of that? The Senator has expressed himself as opposed to dividing this activity up among many agencies, and I am in sympathy with that viewpoint, but I am also in sympathy with the Department of Labor having sole jurisdiction over this matter.

Mr. HAYDEN. The difficulty is that the Children's Bureau would have no

way of contacting the school system with respect to how the children are to be taken care of before and after school. That is where the Office of Education comes in.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Children's Bureau could do anything at all it certainly could look after that particular function, that is if that Bureau were to have any control at all over the child.

Mr. HAYDEN. What is the objection to competent advice being received from the Office of Education?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There are a great many objections.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is an office which has been in existence since immediately after the Civil War.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; but it is proposed to give the Office of Education considerably increased authority, power, and jurisdiction over American children.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; we require the State to set up a plan under which it is going to handle this situation. Then the coordinator submits the matter, so far as the health angle is concerned, to the Office of Public Health; as it relates to the children themselves, to the Children's Bureau; as it relates to the school system, to the Office of Education, in order to obtain the advice of these different agencies. But the actual disposition of the money to the State goes through Mr. Taft's organization.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not see why the Children's Bureau itself could not attend to all those matters. I should like to offer my amendment, if the Senator from Arizona does not have very good reason for opposing it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I simply say that I do not see why we should not use an established agency of the Government if we need its advice.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. But I do not think it is needed, and I do not think it ought to be used. That is my objection.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I understood the able Senator was about through with his remarks.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I ask the Senator whether the amendment under consideration was presented to the House committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. And was it rejected by the House?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; because what it covered was not authorized by law.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that was the answer I expected would be made to my question by the able Senator in charge of the bill. This amendment was offered in the House and was objected to because it did not conform to the rule. That is precisely the position I took when the matter came up a few moments ago. This is an effort on the part of the Appropriations Committee to legislate. We never enact proper legislation by disobeying the rules of the Senate, and if there is any one rule which

has the sanction of wisdom and practice, which is calculated to assure good legislation, it is the rule that legislative matters should be referred to legislative committees having jurisdiction, and that the Appropriations Committee appropriate money therefor.

The able Senator in charge of the appropriation bill has presented this large amendment which ought to be referred either to the Committee on Education and Labor or to the Committee on the Judiciary. It is purely a matter of legislation. The colloquy which has ensued shows that there is a great difference of opinion as to how this matter should operate. It is a project which has not been authorized by Congress. It has been conceived by a committee which has no jurisdiction over it.

Mr. President, I think the project is a worthy one. I hope that something can be worked out with respect to it, but it cannot be worked out by a committee which has no jurisdiction, and which held meager hearings, and for that reason was turned down by the House. I think it is an imposition upon the Senate, speaking with great frankness, for the Appropriations Committee to suggest an important amendment of this kind which involves a question of policy—the jurisdiction of bureaus and departments of Government—and have it offered on the floor of the Senate by the subcommittee chairman, and expect us to consider it without any hearings whatsoever having been had upon it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I would agree with the Senator from Oregon if that is what we did. What we did was to bring in the text of the Budget estimate submitted to Congress because we are at war, and we want to employ women in factories, and we need them right away.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that is a lamentably poor answer. It is puerile. It does not dignify the controversy at all to say that the amendment was brought up simply because the Director of the Bureau of the Budget happened to place his stamp of approval upon the use of money which is now being expended out of the Treasury by a different agency of the Government. The Bureau of the Budget does not legislate for Congress or for the people of the United States.

What we need, Mr. President, is a little deliberation and a little sanity in respect to these matters. Let us follow the rules which have the sanction of years of usage—which have been a direct guide to our feet as we travel along the legislative path.

Laudable as this proposal is, it should be referred to a committee which has jurisdiction to hold hearings and make determination with respect to which bureau or agency or department should administer the matter, and how it should be done. In the meantime would anything be lost by doing that? The able Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has said that there are funds sufficient to take care of this matter until the end of the present fiscal year, June 30, 1943, and this day, my calendar shows—

though I have not consulted it—is the 12th day of March. We have ample time to legislate. The project is a legislative one. The matter should be handled in a legislative way. The able Senator from Arizona has attempted at all times to conform to the rules of the Senate, and has manifested himself on many occasions to be careful as to how questions of legislation should be handled on the floor of the Senate. I think it is a very unfair imposition on the Senate to ask it to legislate on an appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I make a point of order against the amendment, as I did earlier today, and it will require a two-thirds vote of the Senate to provide for consideration of the amendment.

I think the Senator from Arizona should withdraw the amendment and let the matter be worked out through the proper channels.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to have an expression of opinion from the Members of the Senate on the matter, because I want to know who is interested in taking care of the children of working women. This work has to be done and done right away. I think we can act intelligently on the matter. I want the expression of the Senate, and if the proposal does not receive a two-thirds majority it will not be in the bill. If it does receive a two-thirds majority, it will be in the bill. We have a two-thirds rule to take care of such questions.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the statement made by the Senator is not a just one. I think I am as sympathetic with the children and the mothers of the country as is the able Senator from Arizona. I think this is probably a worthy project. It is not now in the form, however, in which we can intelligently act on it. I am only asking for a little time. The Senator from Arizona has not been able to convince me that this work must stop today if we do not pass the bill with the Senator's amendment in it.

Mr. President, further I prophesy that the rules of the House are such, and are so respected, that this amendment would quickly go out when it went to the House on the question of voting on a conference report, or if it should come up for a separate vote. There is no reason to stand up in the Senate and in the name of patriotism, or love of home, tell me that this thing has to be done right now. It is perfectly absurd to make such a statement. If the Senator were more familiar with the rules of the Senate and desired more carefully to obey the injunction or the wisdom which is embodied in the rules, he would not make a statement of the kind he has just made.

Mr. President, I have said all I wish to say. I am interested only in good legislation. My heart is full of sympathy for the project, but, as a matter of orderly procedure, I should like to have a vote taken on the question at this time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I think we have heard about all that is to be said about the matter. I ask for a vote.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill if he can tell me whether a large number of the members of the Commit-

tee on Appropriations were present when this matter came up for consideration.

Mr. HAYDEN. I cannot say as to that, Mr. President. We had a fairly large attendance in the subcommittee right along.

Mr. GERRY. How many members of the committee were present when the bill was reported from the subcommittee? Were only the members of the subcommittee present?

Mr. HAYDEN. We had a fairly full attendance of the subcommittee at all times. I do not recollect how many members were present at the time the matter came before the full committee, but I know that the full membership of the committee was not present when the committee met.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arizona.

The proposed amendment seems to me to delegate very large powers. It is another example of appointing agencies, and then delegating powers, and having really no accurate idea of what the total sum involved will be, or what will be required. Of course, it is much easier to delegate wide powers, and permit an agency to administer them, than it is to try and be more specific, and make the States do their own work in connection with these agencies.

Mr. President, one trouble with the amendment is that under it, it is proposed to delegate to certain agencies powers that the States themselves should really have, if such a thing as is here proposed should be done. Under this amendment we would be saying through a Federal agency in Washington what is to be done in this State or in that State. Under the amendment I am afraid we would be getting into a situation where hard-and-fast rules would be established—such rules as have not worked well in the past—and in this case might very seriously affect the most important thing in our country—that is, the family—the mothers of the country and the children.

Mr. President, if delegation of powers such as is proposed under the amendment is made, the question also arises whether we will not be taking its functions away from private charity, which is sympathetic, and depriving of their functions private agencies which really understand the local wants, and turning the whole matter into administration under hard-and-fast rules, which will not work effectively, and will result in hardships to the very people we are trying to aid.

Mr. President, it was for this reason that I felt that the amendment should have received a great deal more study than apparently it has received. The House rejected it, I imagine, for much the same reasons I have in mind. However, it seems to me that in going so far as to control by agencies, such as those referred to, what mothers shall pay, apparently depending on what they earn—and in some States, of course, that question involves the cost of living—no hard-and-fast rules can be prescribed. When we continue to draw back into the Federal Government we always get further

and further away from the proper understanding of local conditions. It is for this reason that I cannot vote for the amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I agree in general with everything which the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] has said relative to the proper legislative procedure. I have been convinced for many months that a manpower crisis of major proportions is developing in this country. I believe that there is a tendency for us to be behind the rest of the country in appreciation of the development of the problems which are associated with the war. That is not due to any fault of ours. It is due to the fact that we are detained in Washington and, for the most part, are unable to go frequently to our States or our Congressional districts and make personal investigation to ascertain how the impact of the war is affecting the various communities of the Nation.

With the Army requiring 400,000 men a month, the manpower shortage has developed to major proportions. We have been discussing one aspect of the question in connection with the measure which is now the unfinished business of the Senate, and temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the pending deficiency appropriation bill. I hope to have something to say more in detail concerning this problem when we return to the consideration of the unfinished business.

Mr. President, it is obvious that if the size of the army is to be as large as contemplated, if the draft upon manpower is to go forward at the same level as it has been going forward in the past several months, or in an accelerated manner, there will be only 2 groups to which we can turn for manpower to take the place of those who have gone into the armed services. We can, in order to obtain labor, reach into the older age groups, or into the group of women.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. Why not reach into the departments of the Government in Washington?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am in favor of seeing to it that those in the Government service who are not essential to the functioning of government are subjected to the draft in the same manner as those who are in any other employment. However, Mr. President, it is no answer to the problem to say that we are going to rid Washington of any persons—if there be such here—who have evaded their responsibility to the country and avoided military service. The labor force of the Nation is in the neighborhood of 54,000,000; and to talk about eliminating a comparatively few persons in the Government service, wherever they may be, is no answer to the manpower shortage which today threatens agricultural and industrial production.

Mr. President, I was about to say, before I was interrupted, that one of the great sources to which we must turn if we are to permit our armed force to in-

crease is the women of the country. We cannot escape it. If we are to take women we should, of course, first take those who are single, or those who have no dependents, in accordance with the voluntary control of manpower under the direction of the Manpower Commission. All the influence of the Government has been utilized to restrain women with children or other dependents from going into industry until they are absolutely needed.

We have reached the point at which, in order to maintain production schedules upon which men who are dying at this very hour on the far-flung battle fronts of this war depend, we must turn to women who have children, or the production schedules will fail and men will die unnecessarily because proper equipment is not furnished them with which to meet the enemy.

Those in charge of this problem are caught on one or the other horn of a dilemma. As everyone knows there is an increasing disposition in the Congress, which is manifested at both ends of the Capitol, to chop down all the social activities of our Government. I do not criticize Members of Congress for taking that position; but those who are in positions of administrative responsibility would be ignoramuses if they did not realize that such a sentiment exists in Congress at the present time. They were caught on one or the other of the two horns of a dilemma in regard to this program. No person who has looked into the question can deny the need.

Mr. President, I say with great reluctance that the need arises against the background of minor delinquency which is on the increase throughout the country. It is the fault of no one. It is due to the impact of a total and horrible war. It has shaken the moorings and foundations of every home in America. In many instances the men have gone to war. In others they have gone to work in industries and have left their children behind. Naturally the brutalizing influence of war and our modern methods of depicting it through the newspapers, on the screen, and in the publications of the country have had an effect upon the fiber and attitudes of our growing children. It should be a matter of primary concern to every man and woman who cares a whit about the future of this Nation. The children are the oncoming generations. They are the men and women of the future who must meet the problems which we have bungled and failed to solve.

Will we refuse in this situation to give a little care and provide a little organized control over the activities of children in the hours when they are no longer under the influence of either the father or the mother? Do we wish to turn them loose on the streets of boom towns? There are some such towns in the State of a Senator who sits not far from me. We all know the characteristics of boom towns. There is no way in God's world to prevent such influences and environments springing up, despite the efforts of the clergy and the church,

the influence of the home, and the influence of law-enforcement agencies, local, county, State, and Federal.

Mr. President, I do not quarrel with Senators who think that this question should have been considered by a legislative committee. I was about to say that in these times and with the present temper of Congress the administrative agencies would be confronted with the choice of one of two horns of a dilemma. The problem is here, Senators, whether we wish to recognize it or not. One choice is to propose the continuation of a Federal program, such as has been conducted by the W. P. A., under which all the money would come from Washington, the decisions would be made in Washington, and the personnel would be selected by a Federal agency.

The other choice is to resort to a time-honored system which in my opinion has proved its effectiveness, namely, a partnership, a cooperative program between the States and the Federal Government, with the State or individuals within the State putting up one-half the money and the Federal Government putting up the other half.

I know that such a proposal as this would have received short shrift if the administrative agencies had decided solely on a Federal program. I know how the welkin would ring in this Chamber with denunciation of the Federal Government for attempting to invade the province of the State and make the sole decision. I suppose it will receive shorter shrift because the agencies have taken the other horn of the dilemma and have tried to work out a program here which would provide for State and Federal participation.

Mr. President, in view of the conditions which I know exist so far as child delinquency throughout the country is concerned, in view of what I know of the situation so far as the manpower crisis is concerned, I say that if there ever was justification for suspending the rule and considering legislation on an appropriation bill, such justification exists in this instance. I know, and every other father in this Chamber knows, that it is the first delinquency, the first mistake, that is serious in the life of any growing child. This program deserves our serious consideration.

I agree in principle with every word the able Senator from Oregon has uttered. It always pains me to be in disagreement with him, because then I think I should review my own facts and ascertain whether my position is sound. It is rather easy to say that the question should be considered by a legislative committee, but I know that many weeks, if not many months, will go by if this matter is referred to a legislative committee. If that is done, I cannot tell, on the one hand, how many women will fail to go into industries where they are vitally needed in order to provide increased manpower to assist in the production of supplies needed for our fighting forces; and, on the other hand, if no care is provided for the children during the absence of their mothers, I

cannot tell what may happen to the children and other dependents of mothers who, yielding to the importunities of the campaign that is going on to have them seek employment in industry, go to work in defense plants.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. REED. I was called from the Chamber for a conference during the time when the distinguished minority leader had the floor; but I desire to say that the administrative agencies are not the only ones with responsibility that were and are caught on the horns of a dilemma. I fully agree that an appropriation of this kind or a measure of this kind, one which would become a law affecting such agencies, should go to a legislative committee.

I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that if the amendment goes to a legislative committee there will be a delay of at least several weeks, perhaps several months. The problem is one which has come upon us during the last year. A few moments ago I tried to describe on this floor what has happened in my own community where, although no women were employed in the factories a year ago, today in a munitions plant with an operating force of 5,500 persons, 40 percent of the employees are women. That was not the case a year ago. Six weeks ago when I was home, the manager told me that he was going to increase that percentage as fast as he could, up to 60 percent. Not all the women will be women with children, but many of them will be. My community is one of the communities which have doubled or almost doubled their population because of the demands of war activities. The situation presents a problem which we must meet. I should prefer to meet it in the normal, more careful way of legislative procedure. I am a member of the committee. I have a responsibility. I have no pride of opinion in the matter. I do not like this way of handling it. I am not sure that in the end it will be the best way; but I am sure that it is the way that will promise the quickest action, and provide the most ready amelioration of the situation, and that it is the only way to meet the problem which has come upon us during the present great emergency. If some Senators do not want to suspend the rule and use the proposed method of approach, that is their responsibility, not mine.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to say a further word. I share with every other individual, agency, organization, and group in the United States the apprehension about the impact of total war upon the homes of America. That apprehension is not a new one on my part. I have entertained it from the time when the war broke out in Europe until we entered the war. When we were considering the repeal of the arms embargo, I discussed the effects of war upon this country and upon family life at some length. I shall not burden

the Senate by repeating that discussion; but I know what the effect will be, and I know that it will not be good. Mr. President, we are involved in the war. We have no choice except to draw upon the services of the married women of the Nation—and among them millions who have dependents—if we are to keep our commitments to the armed forces of the Nation and to the nations that are receiving aid under lend-lease.

Let me say that reports from various communities show too many children without adult supervision, they show that many ill children are uncared for; that children from 8 to 10 years of age are responsible for the care of much younger children, and that problems of juvenile delinquency which I have mentioned, are increasing. According to information in the hands of the Children's Bureau, recent partial surveys in 49 areas in which are located industries participating in the war effort, showed over 61,700 children in need of care, of whom 27 percent were under 6 years of age, and 73 percent were between the ages of 6 and 14 years. I do not have to say to any other father in this Chamber that, so far as delinquency is concerned, the ages between 6 and 14 years are perhaps the most serious ages through which a child goes in its development into an adult person.

Mr. President, by voting down the amendment we shall not stop the impact of war upon the homes of America. We shall not prevent married women with dependent children from going to work. If we vote down the amendment we shall have to assume the responsibility of denying to the men on the battle fronts of the world the arms which they need in order to have a fair chance to win in the fight against our brutal enemies. If we vote down the amendment I do not believe the program will cease altogether. If Congress should refuse to give consideration to this matter on a technical ground, the Chief Executive and those responsible in the administrative agencies would be derelict in their duty it seems to me, if they did not search for every available means whereby they could provide care—perhaps inadequate care, but at least some kind of care—to prevent children from running loose upon the streets.

Mr. President, what will be the situation if the Senate votes down the amendment? Will we take the W. P. A. program, which is purely a Federal program operated from Washington, under which the decisions are made in Washington, with personnel selected under rules and regulations laid down from Washington, and with the local communities controlled by the W. P. A. organization; or will we take the best program it has thus far been possible to devise, after careful consideration, for a joint partnership between the States and the Federal Government in meeting what every student of the question will grant is a serious menace to the future of America? Should we not meet that problem on the basis of a cooperative

plan under which the States will have at least something to say about how the program is to be conducted?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator know whether the States already have set up an organization, whether they have a plan? Are they ready to cooperate, or will they have to pass legislation?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is my understanding that the amendment is so drawn that every State in the Union may participate.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. They will have to submit a plan; but certainly every State in the Union that is engaging in any welfare activities of any kind may participate. The amendment has been criticized by the Senator from Virginia; but it has been left open to take care of the situation in States whose legislatures may not be meeting or in States which may not have emergency boards which could provide emergency appropriations. Therefore, the amendment has been left open, so that the State's share of the money can come from individuals or from any other source—for instance, in case the individuals in a State provide funds to pay one-half of the State's cost for the care, or in case a State's industrial plants make contributions for that purpose. In other words, the money does not necessarily have to come as the result of legislative action by the States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. On page 1, line 1, we find the following language:

For payments to States for expenditure in accordance with State plans—

And so forth. I understand from that language that the only way the money could be used would be through the medium of the States.

My question has been partly answered by the Senator. Let me repeat it: Is legislative action required by the States?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I cannot give the Senator a categorical answer; but I will risk the statement that in view of the social-security program which has been developed in this country, I should say that practically all States would have administrative set-ups already functioning under a similar grant-and-aid system for other purposes—set-ups which could be utilized for this purpose without legislative action on the part of the States.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to pursue the matter to a logical conclusion.

Mr. REED. If the Senator from Wisconsin will permit me to make a suggestion in that regard, I shall touch on the matter of the logical conclusion, if the Senator from Colorado will permit me to do so.

The Senator from Colorado quoted the language directing that the payment be

made to States. The following language is found on page 1, line 7:

And for payments to subdivisions of States for expenditure in accordance with such plans.

The grant is not confined to the States. It may be made to the subdivisions of States—cities, counties, any subdivision of a State that has authority to do work of this kind and to carry out a program of this kind.

I beg the pardon of the Senator from Wisconsin for interrupting. I feared that my good friend the Senator from Colorado had overlooked the language to which I have now called attention.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator from Kansas for his helpful suggestion, but I will say again that I think, in view of the programs which have been inaugurated under the various titles of the Social Security Act, there is not a State in the Union that has not a set-up that can be utilized under this joint co-operative plan between the States and the Federal Government in a similar manner as the programs under the social-security law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. May I say a further word before I yield to the Senator from Colorado? I wish the Senate would consider this matter in the light of the experience which we have already had in this field. I now yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I was wondering if the Senator would object to writing into this bill explicit language so that the organizations already set up in the States for handling children's problems might function under this bill instead of leaving it as a matter of doubt as to whether the State would have to enact legislation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I certainly should have no objection, but, of course, I am merely an humble worker in the vineyard here. The Senator from Arizona is the strawboss who is in charge of the bill; I would have to defer to him. So far as I am concerned, all I am seeking is a better program than we now have. While it is not satisfactory, I am firmly convinced if this proposed legislation is enacted we will have a better program.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a few months ago I talked to a representative of the Federal Works Agency, who told me he was quite sure that we completely misunderstood the work which is being done at the present time by the Federal Works Agency in this matter under the provisions of the Lanham Act. His statement was that, under the appropriation of the Lanham Act, there is authority in the Federal Works Agency to set up community facilities and that what they are doing now is to set up community facilities to give this kind of care to children. The program operates by allowing mothers to pay a part—as I recall, 50 percent—of the cost of maintenance of the facilities. The statement of the gentleman to whom I refer is that W. P. A. was doing work of this sort largely for the purpose of giving employment to workers who were without employment and rendering home service to

indigent families. The W. P. A., he says, is not duplicating the work that is being done under the Lanham Act fund by the Federal Works Agency, but the W. P. A. is now discontinuing work of that kind, and, of course, will be completely finished by the 1st of April.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I think the testimony was that the W. P. A. would be finished on April 30.

Mr. PEPPER. I beg pardon, and I should have said April 30.

Mr. BYRD. It is not certain that they will discontinue even then.

Mr. PEPPER. I am definitely sure that there is no duplication of work by the W. P. A. and the Federal Works Agency under the Lanham Act.

I am in hearty accord with what was said by the able Senator from Wisconsin. Whatever plan will afford the greatest help for mothers and children is the one I should favor. I think there is possibly merit in the point which was suggested by the able Senator from Colorado. As I understand the present plan that is in operation with Lanham Act funds under the Federal Works Agency, it is not operated by governmental agencies necessarily but by community agencies. The community does not put up anything unless it chooses to do so.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may point out two facts?

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. First, I will quote from the testimony given by Mr. Johnstone, general counsel for the Federal Works Agency. He was asked the question:

And all of that—

Referring to nursery school projects—will be discontinued.

Mr. JOHNSTONE. No doubt. The Lanham Act places it on an emergency basis limited to the duration.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you say they were being discontinued, on April 1 or April 30?

Mr. JOHNSTONE. In regard to W. P. A. nursery schools they will all be closed as such by April 30.

That is No. 1.

The question arose in the House as to the authority of the law under which the W. P. A. operates. It is found in subparagraph (c), title II, of the Lanham Act and reads as follows:

To make loans or grants, or both, to public and private agencies for public works and equipment therefor.

And then these words constitute the authority of law under which they operate:

And to make contributions to public or private agencies for the maintenance and operation of public works * * *.

Mr. PEPPER. Is that the Lanham Act?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am quoting from the Lanham Act. The chairman of the committee said:

The CHAIRMAN. Apparently you construe that as maintenance and operation of a service, whereas the terms of the enabling act would seem to indicate that it should be for maintenance of the public works and the equipment itself.

Mr. JOHNSTONE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, the buildings and the equipment, rather than the service. Is it not rather a broad interpretation under that provision, that you have authority to conduct the service of day nurseries in addition to housing and equipment facilities that you were authorized to provide?

Mr. JOHNSTONE. That is a fair question. I think you will find, sir, from the legislative history of this act that the clause which you have last read was inserted in the act to enable the Federal Works Agency to give money to a school district, to employ additional teachers during the first year of the operation of these war schools. Those were the words the committee used in order to do that.

The point is that under the Lanham Act if a building has been constructed in a community for school purposes or otherwise then Lanham Act money may be used to maintain the building for a period of time, but if there has been no Lanham Act activity in any community, then there is no authority of law to undertake the particular kind of work. So they are limited in their scope to places where they have done construction.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. Would that language, particularly the last clause to which the Senator refers, authorize them to set up a structure or to provide facilities for the care of children in a community? Would that be within the purview of the act?

Mr. HAYDEN. The words, quoted by me, namely, "and to make contributions to public or private agencies for the maintenance and operation of public works," constitute the sole authority of law that the W. P. A. has for maintaining care of the children of women employed in industry. Under that provision of law they are doing it. I think it is a very strained construction of the statute.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. I shall be through in a second. I think the able Senator in charge of the bill might attend closer the language of the amendment so as to see to it that there is no prohibition against the use of Federal funds until or unless there is some statutory authority in the local body, because I am not at all sure my State has legislation that authorizes the local community or a State agency to cooperate in a project of this kind. I should like the Federal agency to have discretion in selecting the local agencies with which they would cooperate in carrying out the program. I see no harm that could come from following the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. HAYDEN. There are two suggestions; one that there ought to be affirmative action by the States before the money can be spent, and the other that such action ought not to be required. As the amendment is drawn it is perfectly practicable, because, as the Senator from Wisconsin has pointed out, there is no State in the Union that does not have a welfare agency of some kind. It has to have it in order to operate under the Social Security Act. It is already there. It is merely a question of using the personnel of the established agency of a State to do this work and the Government pays half the cost.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. Is the State or the county required to put up its own tax money or may it use the fees it collects?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is contemplated that 50 percent of the amount will be raised by the mother, out of her wages, paying for the care of her children, which she is glad to do. The mothers do not seek charity, and that is where the local contribution will come from to the greatest possible extent.

Mr. PEPPER. One other question. Suppose, for example, the county welfare board in a certain county wishes to participate in this program, would the county welfare agency be eligible to receive funds which are contributed in this case by the Federal agency?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; it would be highly desirable to use that kind of an agency. The plan has got to be submitted to the State welfare agency. We have got to have some uniformity; we cannot be dealing with 3,000 counties and 3,000 different kinds of plans. So it is provided that the State welfare agency shall submit a plan which, when approved, shall become operative, and there is a requirement under the plan that there shall be a contribution of 50 percent.

Mr. PEPPER. This proposal would not come under any existing social security legislation, would it?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; but there is a welfare agency in every State that can submit a plan to the office in Washington.

Mr. PEPPER. I am afraid what the Senator is overlooking is that in each State, for example, in my State, the public welfare funds are raised for specific purposes, and if the money is not used for the specific purposes—to take care of the children or provide old-age assistance or for the public health—there will not be any money which can be used for the purpose, unless the law is changed by the State legislature, and legislatures in some of the States will not meet for another year.

Mr. HAYDEN. We will have to amend the statute if it does not work, but we are assured that the principal source of this money is from the mother who is earning good wages, and is glad to have the help; and if that is the case, let us try it in that way before we undertake to dip into public funds, so far as the States are concerned.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think it has been amply demonstrated that there are various views concerning the practicability of the proposed legislation, and the form which it should finally assume. I agree with the able Senator from Illinois that it would require enabling legislation passed by the States. I think this is a vicious practice, and, further, it is admitted by the able Senator in charge of the bill and other Senators that we have ample funds to take care of the problem until July of this year.

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, no; I made no such admission.

Mr. McNARY. Then, I make the assertion. I stand on that responsibility. The Lanham Act and others have been

cited, and it has been stated that there will be no abatement of the program in any way; nor would I want to see an abatement. But when the matter comes before us as an authorized piece of legislation, I want to know what form it will take. I am interested in decent, sensible, careful, deliberate legislation.

I understand there is to come along another amendment, very similar to the one we have been considering, which has not been digested by any legislative committee. I repeat, it will be 4 months before we will need any funds for this project, which has never been authorized by the Congress, but which will be authorized by a committee, in my judgment, if it is given opportunity to make a recommendation.

Inasmuch as the Senator persists in his amendment, and will not let a legislative committee consider it, in violation of the rule, I have then only one recourse to take, and that is to ask for the regular order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I have a few observations I should like to make in reference to the proposed amendment. I wish to call attention to a few difficulties which I meet in considering the proposal now before us.

Within the shadow of this Capitol is a nursery where for years married women and widows working in the Government departments have brought their children, and left them while the mothers were at work, and paid for their care; and they are still doing it. Will the amendment relieve them of that obligation? Will it provide for payment to the private charitable institutions which are maintained at these places of money in lieu of what the women are paying now?

Mr. McNARY. If I may answer that, it will not.

Mr. WALSH. In my own State of Massachusetts for years women working in the cotton mills, at a disgracefully low wage, eight or nine or twelve dollars a week, have brought their children to private nurseries, paid weekly for their care, and are still doing it. Are they to be compensated, and are they to be relieved of the obligation of paying for their children, under the amendment? As I interpret the discussion which has taken place, the women who, in munitions factories, are receiving three and four times the wages paid cotton mill workers and similar workers in my State, would receive the benefit of this proposal.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator will pardon me, that is not in contemplation at all.

Mr. WALSH. Is it not especially designed to take care of the children of workers in munitions factories?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, but any State plan submitted in connection with the proposal must indicate that there is to be a contribution by the mother. That must be set out in the beginning, and it is thoroughly understood that that is the principal source of the money to match the Federal cost of the overhead.

Mr. WALSH. There is my difficulty. Where are we going? How much is the contribution? Is it a contribution only by women working in munition plants, or

is it a contribution from poor mothers working here as clerks, at \$1,400 a year? Are they to get for the care of their children some of the money? Are the women with children, working in this city, to get no benefit out of this at all? As I understand, it applies only to the women who happen to have the good fortune to draw almost as much as the men receive—and I am glad they are getting it—women who work in munitions factories.

Mr. HAYDEN. That really is a necessity.

Mr. WALSH. Is it not a necessity for these working women who bring their children at 8 o'clock in the morning and keep them there until 5 o'clock in the afternoon, and work for a meager wage, to get some aid, as well as those in munitions factories, who receive three or four times the pay these poor workers are getting? If I had my way, I should be glad to give something to them all, if we did not have to think of the public treasury and the taxpayers. There is nothing more tragic in life, there is nothing sadder in life, than to see a young mother, or an old mother, dragging her children, in the early hours of the morning, and putting them into a nursery home, and leaving them there all day, and out of her pay envelope making a contribution. But how many millions are we finally to take care of? How can we stop simply with the women who happen to go into the industries where war materials are being manufactured? These are difficulties which come to me as I hear the discussion. Yet my impulse is to help them all, if possible—to help every woman who is left a widow, or whose husband has deserted her, and who has children she has to take care of.

In my State some mothers prefer the private charities, and in some instances the cities do take care of the children, not as much as they would like to take care of them, but unfortunately, we finally have to come back to the question of how much we can afford, just as do the women who have to go to a poor, cheap nursery, instead of to a luxurious nursery, because they cannot afford it. That is an important part of this question. I am disturbed about it, and it gets back to what the Senator from Oregon has said, what are the limitations of the amendment, how far are we going, not today, immediately, but in the future? What kind of a program are we finally going to work out in order to bring this necessary relief to these people?

Now we come to another question about which I wish to comment. I dislike to have to say it, because I suppose it may be said I come from a State which is prosperous. When it comes to a division, in giving Federal funds, between poor States, so-called, and others, I have never been able to distinguish between poor States and rich States, and I will tell the Senate why.

If in my State, or the State of some other Senator, if the property owners have their property for taxation purposes valued to the full limit, we are a rich State, because we can spend more money for our schools and for hospitals and our other charities. If we tax our

people \$40 or \$48 or \$50 a thousand, as is done in some cities, we naturally have more money to spend, and are classed as a wealthy State because we compel our people, through the taxes they pay, to make greater sacrifices. But how about the State which always values its property at far below the real value, and whose tax rate is \$15 or \$18 or \$20 against \$50 per thousand upon the valuation? It is a poor State, it may be said. Is it fair to say a State is poor or rich unless there is an equal standard of valuation of the property and an equal tax rate? Even if we have equality in those matters, we will find some poor States, but in my opinion, until we apply the same system of valuation and the same rate of taxation, we will be unable to reach a fair basis for division of Federal aid to rich or poor States, and we never can do that, because at the time we do it, we go into the most sacred right the people of a State have, namely, the matter of regulating their own tax systems; and that is one of the difficulties that is fundamental to all these problems.

I come back to what now troubles me, which is the question as to where we are to draw the line. I am actuated in voicing these thoughts largely by what the Senator from Oregon said, that there should be more study of this important and humane question. Perhaps I am unfair to the members of the Committee on Appropriations who propose this amendment; but it is admitted that there has not been a full study by all the members of the Committee on Appropriations. As I understand, in those communities where there are war plants, and where women are employed at \$35 and \$40 a week, side by side with women who are receiving \$9 and \$10 and \$12 a week, if they contribute something, their children are going to get aid from the Federal Government. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. The bill provides a plan for wartime care. It is limited to the period of the war, for the protection of children of employed mothers.

Mr. REED. Wherever they are employed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Miss Lenroot testified regarding this matter.

Mr. WALSH. If mothers are employed in this city, are they to be taken care of?

Mr. REED. They are.

Mr. WALSH. Then I was mistaken in assuming that the Senator from Arizona said it did not apply to all women. Are we to take on this burden these women have been carrying for years and years, of caring for their children in private institutions?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; that is the other matter, that the Director "shall not approve any plan except upon his determination that the schedule of fees is the maximum practicable in view of the wages paid in the areas served."

The second question the Senator has raised is answered by Miss Lenroot.

Mr. WALSH. In other words, the administrative board will say that in the city of Boston, or in the city of Springfield, Mass., where there are munitions factories, and women working in the factories, the women will pay part of the

cost and the Federal Government will pay to the State agency a fixed part of the cost. Is that the plan?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; not exceeding 50 percent of the cost.

Mr. WALSH. In the next town, where there are women working for less money, a town which happens not to have munitions plants, in which the women are working in stores or elsewhere, and receiving smaller wages, they are not given any money to provide for taking care of their children?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. I should like to read testimony given in the hearings on this subject.

Mr. WALSH. If those women were to get money for the care of their children it would result in opening the door to every woman who has a child, and who must bring the child to a nursery, or to some place where it may obtain care, when the mother is working; this aid would be given to every woman in the country.

Mr. HAYDEN. No. Let me read the testimony given before the committee on behalf of those who expect to administer the act. Miss Lenroot said:

May I add, Mr. Chairman, that many of these women who will be working in these areas where there is an acute shortage will not be working in war plants, but in laundries and restaurants and other service industries essential to the maintenance of the community life. We know laundries and restaurants are more necessary when we have men and women both working in industry, than otherwise, because the amount of work they can do in the home under those circumstances is much less. The wages in these laundries and restaurants are low. Also, many of these women are wives of husbands in the Army earning private's pay, and some of them are widows without other support.

If there were a community, undisturbed by the war, in which there were no war work of any kind being done it would not be necessary to go there. But if women are taken out of homes and placed in industry, and they have to eat in restaurants, and send their laundry out, other women have to work in those establishments, and I think it is entirely proper that the children of the latter women should also be taken care of, when the mothers work in laundries and restaurants.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, under the operations of the amendment, would the money appropriated under it go to contribute toward the maintenance and help, during working hours, of more working women in this country?

Mr. HAYDEN. I would not say that. It applies to communities where war industries are located.

Mr. WALSH. Very well. The Senator would say it does not apply to the women clerks of this city?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am not passing upon that matter.

Mr. WALSH. That, Mr. President, is the trouble. The Senator is asking us to pass certain legislation, and we want to know where it begins and where it ends. That is the very objection made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. There is no limitation made by the language of the amendment. There is no restriction made by it. No amounts are

determined for the present or the future. Twice as much contribution may be made by a mother in Boston as by one in Trenton, N. J.

Mr. HAYDEN. Depending on what she is earning.

Mr. WALSH. Does the language of the amendment include only women who are employed in munitions factories and industries? Yes or no?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. WALSH. It does not?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. WALSH. It includes women working in laundries and in other services in communities in which munitions plants are located?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. In the next community, where there does not happen to be a munitions plant, those working in laundries and in other services are not covered by the language of the amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. Why should they be? The whole purpose of this amendment is to have women go into munitions factories to take the place of men. That is the whole purpose, and we are confining ourselves to that.

Mr. WALSH. One answer to that is that these very women are receiving more money than women engaged in other work.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, and they should pay more as a result.

Mr. WALSH. And they should receive more. Only a month ago I was in a factory in Massachusetts where shells are being made. Eighty percent of the employees were women. I was very proud of their service, their industry and spirit. If they are married women and happen to have children they will be taken care of in some fashion; they will receive some assistance. Their wages are four or five dollars a day. They are receiving big wages, and they should receive them. But the language of the amendment does not cover women in other places, engaged in other work, who are receiving less money?

Mr. HAYDEN. We do not have a manpower shortage in any place except in war industries. We are taking care of the situation with respect to employment of women in war industries, so they may aid in the manufacture of munitions.

Mr. WALSH. Before the war, under W. P. A., women in industry were provided for.

Mr. HAYDEN. No, under W. P. A., the assistance was confined to a poor woman who had no money. She was given a W. P. A. job, and her situation was taken care of by charity. Another woman was employed to look after her children while she was at work. It was on a charity basis.

Mr. WALSH. No matter how poor a woman is, no matter how many children she has, she must be engaged in working in a war industry or else she must go into her own pocket, or charity must provide for taking care of her children.

Mr. HAYDEN. The amendment provides for women engaged in working in war industry.

Mr. WALSH. Let me ask another question. With respect to private charities, such as the one operating in the shadow of this building, how are they to be paid? Is the institution to be taken over, and is half the money to come from the mother and half from the Government?

Mr. HAYDEN. The welfare agency in the District of Columbia brings in a plan for caring for the children.

Mr. WALSH. Are we going to build institutions where none now exist for them, or use those now existing?

Mr. HAYDEN. We will use those now existing, of course.

Mr. WALSH. Is money to be provided to buy them or rent them?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, we are simply dealing with the conditions as they exist in the State.

Mr. WALSH. If a measure is brought before us proposing to give every penniless poor woman in this country what is necessary to take care of her children, and she is forced to go out to work, we would support it, and provide for a large part of the money necessary. But we want to know what financial and other limitation is placed on what is proposed to be done. We want to know all mothers to whom it applies. We want to know whether it shall apply to a woman receiving \$5 a day, or one receiving 50 cents a day. We should have some sort of limitation fixed. That, Mr. President, is my difficulty. That is why I find myself agreeing with the observations made by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] in respect to this matter.

Mr. President, I am moved to deep sympathy for these women, but we are not reaching the women with children who go out with shawls over their heads and scrub clothes over a washtub all day. This amendment is not for them. However, if women are able to go into a munitions factory and receive more wages than they ever received before—and all praise to them, because they are serving a great and patriotic cause and helping the country—then they are entitled to something that other poor women who have children and who are destitute should have and should receive.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have been struggling desperately to correct the misapprehension under which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] have been laboring. The Senator from Massachusetts has laid considerable stress upon the poor women who are not employed in munitions factories. I agree with what he has said, but that does not happen to be what this amendment provides for at all. Most of what the Senator from Massachusetts has said has no relevancy to this provision, because it is said under a misapprehension of what the amendment provides. I shall read what it provides:

For expenditure in accordance with State plans for the wartime care and protection of children of employed mothers.

That is what it provides.

Mr. WALSH. Then, according to the Senator, every mother employed, including the clerks in this city, would receive

the benefit provided under this provision?

Mr. REED. The Senator from Massachusetts did not permit me to interrupt him. I shall cover all these points.

Mr. WALSH. I am sorry. I apologize.

Mr. REED. I assure the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Oregon that I shall try to cover all the points they made. They are both eminent and able Senators, who have rendered distinguished service in this body, but they have gotten off on a tangent and onto something that is not pertinent to this amendment. I am going back to what the Senator from Massachusetts said. Let me read the language again. These are the mothers involved:

For the wartime care and protection of children of employed mothers.

Does that take them all in? Let us see. That depends on whether the States have some plans, whether they are doing that thing now, what arrangement the States or the counties or the municipalities or the District of Columbia have now. If they are taking care of that class of children of employed mothers now, yes, it easily falls under that provision. If a political subdivision is not doing it, it may be brought under this provision by submitting, through the State, a plan for doing it. It is not confined to the children of mothers employed in the munitions plants. I would not be for it, I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts, if such a distinction were to be made.

Mr. WALSH. Did not the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] say that to me?

Mr. REED. I think the Senator from Arizona, who has had a great burden of responsibility for this measure, for the moment misapprehended what was in it. Any mother with children in any community may, by conforming to the standard of administration set up in this measure, be brought under it. But the community plan must be submitted and it must have approval. How is it going to be paid for? Partly by the local contributions, and the local contributions, as has repeatedly been stated here, are dependent upon what contributions may be made by mothers. If a mother in a laundry, receiving \$9 a week, cannot contribute, the local community, whether it be the District, a city, or a county, will help. The mother employed in a munitions plant who draws a minimum of 60 cents an hour ought to contribute, and will be expected to contribute. The only limitation in this amendment is that the Federal Government shall not contribute more than 50 percent. The other 50 percent may be raised in any way the local community desires.

Mr. President, I had not intended to speak again upon this subject. I was impelled to do so only by the evident misapprehension under which the very able Senator from Massachusetts was laboring. I share most of his objections. I share the objection of the Senator from Oregon. This is legislation. It ought to go through a legislative committee; but the situation is that the W. P. A. expires by limitation, I think, on the 30th of April, so far as most of its activities are concerned. I want it to expire. I voted

to have it expire. But here is one of the things which the W. P. A. very largely has done to take care of the children of employed mothers. The W. P. A. is going out of business. We have a short period which should be provided for. If we have any sense of humanity, any sense of decency, any sense of responsibility, we will take care of these people. The appropriation in this bill is limited to the 30th of June 1943, and is intended to take care of this emergency situation which has been growing larger and deeper and graver ever since we have been facing this incredible confusion in manpower, a subject about which I shall speak at more length when we come to consider the unfinished business before the Senate. This is temporary. I agree with the Senator from Oregon. I do not like to do it this way. I would rather do it the other way. But this is to be for only 3 months in order to take care of a temporary situation. It is no great departure to write a little legislation in an appropriation bill. I agree with the Senator from Oregon that it is a bad practice, but it is a practice of which the Senate is frequently guilty. The Senate has been guilty of departing from Senate practice on many occasions when there was not as much justification for it as there is in the present situation. That is the only reason why the Senator from Arizona and I are appealing to the Senate for this method—not because we think it is the best, but because we say that in the immediate situation it is the only method by which the problem can be taken care of.

Mr. DANAHER obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to suspend the rule to permit him to offer an amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Possibly the Chair was not so informed, but a moment ago I stated that I was not satisfied with the procedure which was being followed and that I wished to invoke the rule of the Senate. I asked for the regular order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, what does that mean?

Mr. McNARY. I can explain the meaning of it.

Mr. LUCAS. I believe I understand the meaning of it, but I should like to have the Chair state it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon have in mind returning to the consideration of the unfinished business?

Mr. McNARY. That is exactly what I have in mind. There is no clearer way of expressing myself. A request for the regular order has the sanction of parliamentary usage. However, in making that request, I am not attempting to take the Senator from Connecticut [Mr.

DANAHER] from the floor. I am willing to allow the debate to continue as long as he desires, but I ask for the regular order.

Mr. LUCAS. It was my understanding that the regular order had been demanded, and that was the reason I made the inquiry as to what is before the Senate at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order having been demanded, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

DEFERMENT FROM MILITARY SERVICES OF PERSONS ENGAGED IN AGRICULTURE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 729) providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agricultural occupations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHN-SON].

OFFICE OF DEFENSE HEALTH AND WELFARE SERVICES

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, one of the most interesting phases of the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is its many-sidedness. It apparently admits of construction according to the interpretation placed upon it by any given Senator. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] told us in his concluding plea that this proposal was intended to cover the next 3½ months only. There was to be nothing permanent about it, the Senator from Kansas said. It would apply only until June 30.

Mr. President, consider that single statement as the basis upon which the Senator from Kansas would urge upon us the adoption, in an appropriation bill, of a matter of fundamental policy, to be adopted now, for 3½ months, and to be set up in every State and every community which is said to be affected, or likely to be affected by it. If there be advantages in the proposal, does anyone in his right mind believe that on July 1, they would be terminated? Were there benefits, as urged, accruing to the communities in the care of children, does anyone even remotely imagine that at the end of 3½ months the plan would be dropped?

I mention those things, Mr. President, to demonstrate the speciousness of the way in which the issue has been presented to us. There is scarcely a Senator who is a proponent of the pending measure who has not fallen into such error in one way or another. For example, the Senator from Arizona said that the issue is whether or not Senators wish to vote in favor of suspending aid to the children of war-working mothers. The plain implication of his request for a yea and nay vote on the previously pending motion to suspend the rule was that if Senators should take a position counter to that of the Senator from Arizona they would be put on record as voting against extending aid for the care of children of working war mothers.

Mr. President, in posing the issue in that way he intended that pressure should be brought to bear in the minds of Senators to cast their votes in favor of the proposal which he submitted.

Completely ignored in that presentation, Mr. President, was the fact that more than \$17,000,000 is available this minute under the Lanham Act, which has been and is being administered to provide payments for the child day-care program in communities which choose to apply for it, and which have a program as part of the essential war effort which comports with the needs of the community.

Mr. President, if there are war-time needs in given communities they may apply for aid under the Lanham Act. When they establish their needs they receive their allowances. That program is going on now. There is no issue of lack of congressional interest in the care of children when the mothers are employed in war work. Clearly, under the Lanham Act, working mothers are receiving the benefits of the concern which has been so eloquently voiced by Senators who completely overlook the application of the Lanham Act to the problem.

In addition, there is, of course, such residue of the W. P. A. as was left. As I recall, from an examination of the hearings—although I am not on the committee and have not given to this vast subject all the time it requires—the W. P. A. appropriation terminates as of April 30, although there may be an extension to June 30 from Presidential funds, in order to liquidate.

I do not know whether that is a completely accurate statement of the situation concerning the W. P. A. However, I do know that the lack of all facts is not confined solely to me. There are other Senators who do not know, and I take some comfort on that account. I cite that fact as an additional reason why this fundamental matter of policy should be considered by a legislative committee, which can supply all facts and which can make recommendations to us as to how best to develop the entire approach.

Let us take up another phase of the argument of the Senator from Arizona. He has told us that on page 3 of the amendment, in lines 12 to 20, inclusive, there is a provision that the Lanham Act appropriations or the W. P. A. funds, as the case may be, and the programs being executed under them, must be terminated upon the adoption of his proposed amendment. Let us see what the amendment provides. I quote from line 12 on page 3 of the amendment:

Provided further, That any equipment which is under the control of the Federal Works Agency and which is necessary to a project for the care of children of employed mothers already in operation and in use at the time such project is placed under this program may be transferred for the purposes hereof to other Federal agencies as the Director of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services may prescribe, and the appraised value thereof shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

There is no "shall" about it. There is no mandatory requirement involved. It

does not cover operations. It applies only to equipment, Mr. President. It provides that equipment "may be" transferred, and says nothing about operations.

The Senator from Kansas argued the question whether the proposal was to extend to the children of all employed mothers, or whether it applied only to the children of mothers who are employed in war industries. The Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Kansas pointed to page 1 of the amendment. They pointed out, in line 2, on page 1, the following language:

expenditure in accordance with State plans for the wartime care and protection of children of employed mothers—

There is no qualification of the term "employed mothers," or other adjectival description whatever. There is no distinction between employed mothers who have husbands who are also working and widows. It is not in terms required that they be in war industry. No limitation of any character is stated. So far as it purports to refer to State plans, this proposal, if adopted, would clearly extend to 48 States, and down through the States to heaven knows how many communities. It is a matter of common knowledge that only a very few States are affected to any extent by wartime industries and demands for care for children of mothers in wartime industries.

Mr. President, to show how the amendment can be construed, not only as the Senator from Kansas has construed it, but otherwise, as the Senator from Massachusetts argued, let us turn again to page 3 where, in line 7, we find, as a part of a proviso, that no payment from this appropriation shall be available—

for operating expense, alterations, repairs, or equipment except in areas with special needs because of substantial increase in employment of women arising out of the war.

Ending the quotation at that point, Mr. President, it becomes perfectly apparent that if there be need for an expenditure for operating expense or the alteration or repair of equipment or property and buildings, it may be made only in areas where there are special needs because of substantial increases in employment of women, arising out of the war.

Thus, if there is to be an expenditure in any amount in excess of \$1,000—that is the limitation previously stated—it must be made under the conditions thus set forth. Implicit, then, in the language, Mr. President, is the representation that we are adopting what will in effect be a permanent pattern of grants-in-aid—a "force" bill, as we have come to call such bills, in which the Federal Government demands that States submit their plans to someone in a bureau in Washington, and if the Washington bureau approves the plan the particular State will gain certain advantages from Federal contributions, but if the State fails to meet the requirements of the Washington bureau, it will not receive the aid.

On the one hand, Mr. President, the amendment purports to apply to women who have children, without any definition whatsoever of the nature of the employment of the women; but when we

come to make it effective, back on page 3 we find the provision that no operations involving an amount in excess of \$1,000 can be conducted unless there is in fact an increase, a "substantial increase," in employment of women arising out of the war.

It is easy to see how contradictory constructions can arise, in view of the instances I have cited.

The moment that we impose under the bill a Nation-wide program, one applicable to the 48 States, each of which in order to gain any advantage under the bill must submit a plan, it follows that State organizations must be created. It follows, further, that if there be no organization in a State, legislation by the State will be called for in order to set up the organization. States cannot sprout programs for the management of child-day-care centers. They must, in accordance with their constitutions and laws, develop such programs. There must be agencies to handle them.

Therefore, Mr. President, we would be forcing States to act in accordance with the dictates of this Congress were we to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Arizona. We would reach into every home where there is a mother, and say to her, "Never mind the institution down the street that is adequately equipped to take care of your child, and with which you have been dealing; never mind that facility which may, indeed, far surpass in advantages anything that Washington may offer. If you want to come under the program for aid to the States, you must develop your State plan our way. Otherwise you will not be allowed to participate."

That is what we would be saying. New agency operatives would be created to the possible neglect and decay of valued existing facilities.

Again, Mr. President, if the State does not act, the amendment would include a local community—a "subdivision," a city, a county, perhaps; it may be a taxing district, for all I know. The bill provides "for payments to subdivisions." That language appears in line 7, at the bottom of page 1 and the top of page 2, where we read of payments to subdivisions other than the States, and smaller, but within the States.

Mr. President, where is this proposal to stop? Under what plan or program will some subdivision in a State benefit, whereas other subdivisions in the same State or in other States will not participate? Who will decide that? Someone down in Washington.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. Certainly.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Connecticut is always eminently fair. I am sure he would want his remarks understood in the light that no community, State, or individual is subjected to any kind of compulsion, but that in order to take advantage of the program, the cooperation, whether of an individual, a city, a county, or a State, is to be purely voluntary, and will involve nothing more than the cooperation of such an individual, city, county, or State.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I was glad to yield to the Senator from Kan-

sas. Let me ask whether he would be willing to respond to a question or two from me.

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. Very well. Let me submit to the Senator from Kansas that, let us say, in the city of Topeka there will be said to exist a need for a child-day-care center. Let us assume that the State of Kansas has never adopted any child-day-care-center program. If the city of Topeka wishes to set up such a child-day-care center, is it not the understanding of the Senator from Kansas that under the bill, within the meaning of the word "subdivision", appearing on page 1, line 7, the city might formulate a plan and submit it to Washington for a grant in aid?

Mr. REED. It could, certainly; yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes. If the proposed plan thus submitted by the city of Topeka did not conform to whatever the people in Washington in charge of the program demanded, the plan would be rejected; would it not?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. Of course. Consequently, in order to procure compliance with the Washington program in Topeka which, for our hypothetical case, we assume has demonstrated an actual need, that community would be told that it could not receive any advantages under the bill unless it conformed to the requirements of the Federal Government; would that not be so?

Mr. REED. The Senator from Connecticut understands as well as I do and as well as every other Senator does that under all the cooperative plans involving Federal expenditures and cooperation—plans ranging all the way from those handled by the Department of Agriculture to those handled by all the other departments—the State program or State plan, whether it be for a board of health, for a State educational institution, or for benefits for agriculture, must conform to the rules laid down by Congress or under the authority given to the appropriate agency of the Federal Government. There is no argument about that.

While I am on my feet, let me say—I do not want to interrupt the Senator for more than a moment—

Mr. DANAHER. Am I to understand from the record that the Senator's answer is that the city of Topeka would have to conform?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. Very well.

Mr. REED. Let me say to the Senator from Connecticut that the invariable rule is that when the Federal Government and one of the States make a joint expenditure to supply funds for State and local needs under some standard, the standard always is established by the Congress or by an administrative authority acting under direction from the Congress. I regret to say that sometimes the administrative authorities do not always follow that rule; but that is the invariable rule.

While I am on my feet, will the Senator from Connecticut permit me to say a further word?

Mr. DANAHER. Certainly.

Mr. REED. The measure is a war-time measure. It is intended to meet war-time needs. The war-time needs certainly are much more severe in areas affected by the stress of war—communities where, because of the demands of war, much greater additional employment of industrial workers has become necessary—than in other communities. The appropriations provided by the bill are limited to the period ending the 30th of June—3½ months from now. No dollar appropriated under the bill can be spent after the 30th of June. The bill contains that definite limitation of authority. I tried to make that point plain during the debate a short time ago.

The part of the amendment which sets up the plan does not provide any definite date for termination of the authority. Of course, frequently we do provide a definite date for termination of authority. Such provision is not made under the present appropriation; but the appropriation asked for is limited—and the committee recognized that point—to the period ending the 30th of June, 3½ months from now.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kansas; because each time he has ventured to comment on some particular, he made the more conclusive the argument I offer on the point he mentions. When he tells the Members of the Senate that the bill is just a wartime measure and would be in effect only until June 30, what possible sophistry would he vent upon us and the country? Would he have us think that the program would be good for only 3½ months, and not thereafter? Would he have us think that the war will end on the 30th of June? Is that his thought? Would he have us think that when we have established a program offering the asserted advantages in 48 States, we will not continue it in September and in the coming January?

Mr. President, of course on the face of things it is perfectly obvious that, once the program were established it would be continued. The very reason why the Senator from Kansas and other Senators who are proponents of the program seek to foist it upon the country is that they know that if we undertake it for 3½ months, we will not abandon it thereafter.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I join the Senator from Connecticut in the position he takes. I have not been on the floor during the general discussion and the debate; but let me ask whether it is not true that the proposed program would provide a duplication of facilities. Are not such facilities being provided under the Lanham Act?

Mr. DANAHER. Let me say to the Senator that, as the program stands, it would provide for a triplication of facilities.

Let me review the history of the matter for a moment, for the Senator from New Hampshire. In the first place, this

particular organism, if I may so classify it, to be known as the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services, is another one of these Presidential-directive creations dangling from a loose end of an Executive order. That is what it amounts to. It is developing under a situation something like that under which the Board of Economic Warfare was originated back in July 1941. It was said and intended to be a coordinating agency. The B. E. W. was going to unify activities in the defense and, later, in the war effort. But, Mr. President, let me say that, like Topsy, it just "grewed," and now there are more than 4,000 persons in it, and in 8 months it drained more than \$1,000,000,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

If Senators will look at the Presidential directive which appears in the House hearings at page 728, they will find that the President intended and directed that the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services should coordinate various ventures in the field of health and nursing, and all that sort of thing, which, operating with Federal funds might conceivably be working at cross purposes, and if so, might be correlated and be channeled into prescribed directions in future.

So there was picked to head the particular organization or organism—I will adopt my own terminology—one of the ablest men in the United States, Mr. Charles Phelps Taft. The President could not have picked a better man. As a matter of fact, let me say to the Senator from New Hampshire if this proposal contemplated that we turn over to the distinguished Mr. Charles Phelps Taft the sum of \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year 1943-44 and told him to go out and operate, and expend that amount to the best advantage of the people, in establishing child day-care centers, I should be willing to do that. That, however, is not involved, Mr. President. This amendment calls for payments to the States. So we found that the W. P. A. appropriations were to lapse as of April 30 of this year, and there has been some talk about additional funds to be added to the W. P. A. account to operate until the liquidation of the W. P. A., which will come to its demise as of June 30 this year.

Coincidentally is to be found another program under the Lanham Act. It is my recollection that there is some \$300,000,000 available under the Lanham Act. I may be in error as to that, but I think I am right. I think there were some \$283,000,000 allocated for certain specific purposes under the act, mainly defense housing construction, and that \$17,000,000 remain available for aid to existing children's day-care centers, and similar facilities.

Let me say to the Senator from New Hampshire that the way they operate is this: A given community through the appropriate certifying agency must sponsor the child day-care center or other facility in the community, and, as Miss Lenroot said in the hearings on this matter—I read from page 147 of the Senate hearings—

There are in every State and locality welfare and child-care agencies which have been doing work for children and which, even before any

money was made available, were trying to shift their programs to the extent possible to meet these new needs.

That meets the needs of wartime, of course. She had already pointed out that the plan is based upon the utilization of existing resources. The Lanham Act, do you not see, contemplates that existing facilities are available for the job when certified as essential to the war effort under local sponsorship. The sponsor may be the State board of education; it may be the local board of education; it may be the State commission of health and welfare. Unless the local facility thereafter can receive a certificate from the Office of Education or from the Department of Labor that, in fact, it is essential to the wartime effort the application will be denied. On the other hand, the Federal Works Agency Board, on the certification of wartime need and on the certification of compliance with the standards prescribed, passes on the application, and if it be approved, the Board then reports to the President that all conditions have been met, whereupon funds are allocated to the existing facility. The standards are locally passed upon and the Federal agencies certify. New programs are not created, we utilize what we have; we do not take children out of the homes they are now in; we do not go into a State and say, "Submit a plan and we will decide your community needs"; we do not stimulate within a State, activities looking to the creation within each of 40 or 50 or 100 communities of a demand for applications for child day-care centers. Will we operate through existing facilities under the Lanham Act or create new ones through the States? That is what is involved, I think, let me say in answer to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I am familiar with the Lanham Act and the way it was operated, and last year there were 322 cities, towns, or communities where nurseries were being operated. In my State of New Hampshire in one small city, Laconia, they made a contract with the school board, and the project is being operated very successfully in that community, which caters to war conditions, war orders, and war industries. I myself think, in this period through which we are passing, we ought to do everything we can to try to avoid duplication or triplication of services and activities of the Federal Government.

Mr. DANAHER. In pursuance of the thought suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire, if, in fact, the program is not to be conducted except as part of the effort required during wartime, and if it be the intention that it shall terminate when the wartime need shall expire, what better machinery could be provided to secure that end than one which, by its very terms, will expire within 6 months from the cessation of hostilities, as the Lanham Act does? The question, after everything is said and done, is fundamental. It is not merely an appropriation of \$2,973,000; it is not merely an appropriation to operate this program to supplant all existing programs from now until June 30; it is a program to cause

States to develop plans. It is a plan to cause communities to develop plans to meet certain fixed requirements under which the children will be taken from the homes, from the aunt while the mother works, from the sister while the mother works, not merely in war industries, but all employed mothers. That is the act in terms.

It is an insidious thing, Mr. President; it is a very subtle approach. The House clearly saw through it, and, at least under the rules of the House, they knew that they had no business on an appropriation bill to attach such a rider. The question of policy is such that the whole proposal should be studied, Mr. President, by an appropriate committee of the Senate. Federal funds might well and properly be provided to take care of children of working mothers who are engaged in war industries, or who, by virtue of wartime exigencies, need care in child day-care centers. There is no question of that, and it can be done under the auspices of the local authority, utilizing existing facilities, meeting standards which have long since met the test, not some newly created by a mushroom agency. We ought to explore this matter thoroughly into its most intimate details and through legislative committees which are authorized and skilled from their own past experience to enter that particular field.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I am glad to yield when the Senator from Nebraska addresses the Chair, but I do not want to be taken off my feet. I have not quite concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not asking the Senator to yield; I am asking for recognition from the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I shall briefly conclude, let me say to the Senator from Nebraska. I think, Mr. President, that I have covered the points I had sought most to make with reference to the arguments hitherto offered. There is much that can be said on this problem, which, if considered in all its aspects, should be considered as a matter of policy, as distinguished from program. There remain questions which demand further discussion. I believe, however, that the question of policy is not necessarily before us at this time. I believe that the point earlier made by the Senator from Oregon was well taken. I believe, if and when we recur to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona, that the rule should not be suspended to take up this proposal at this time, and while I recognize that the parliamentary situation is now altered and that the pending question is on the Bankhead bill, I may, Mr. President, wish to speak further on the other matter should it again be brought before the Senate.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1943

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it is quite evident that I shall not be able to perform my duty until there has been a vote of the Senate. If two-thirds of the Senators are unwilling to vote to suspend

the rule, of course, that will end the matter. I should like to have such an expression of opinion. The only way I can accomplish that in the present parliamentary situation is to move to proceed to the consideration at this time of House bill 1975, the deficiency appropriation bill. I make that motion, with the hope that if a majority of the Senators desire to go on with the bill, we can immediately have a vote on suspending the rule. If a majority of the Senate does not want to proceed to the consideration of the bill, then I will know, of course, that my amendment could not be adopted through a suspension of the rule by a two-thirds vote. I therefore make the motion that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the deficiency bill.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona to proceed to the consideration of House bill 1975, which will be stated by title.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1975) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

MR. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gillette	Radcliffe
Austin	Guffey	Reed
Bailey	Gurney	Revercomb
Ball	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hayden	Robertson
Barkley	Hill	Scruggam
Bilbo	Holman	Shipstead
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Brooks	Kilgore	Taft
Buck	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Lodge	Tobey
Byrd	Lucas	Truman
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Mead	Walsh
Danaher	Millikin	Wheeler
Davis	Moore	Wherry
Downey	Murdock	White
Eastland	Nye	Wiley
Ellender	O'Daniel	Willis
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Wilson
George	Overton	
Gerry	Pepper	

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 1975. [Putting the question.] The ayes appear to have it.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Division.

On a division, the motion was rejected.

MR. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent temporarily to lay aside the pending bill, with the understanding that when the Senate takes up the deficiency bill I shall withdraw the amendment which has been under discussion, because evidently, if a majority will not vote to take the bill up, two-thirds will not agree to suspend the rule.

MR. McNARY. Mr. President, I made that suggestion a little while ago, and proof seems to be convincing to the able Senator. I now have no objection, if the Senator will abandon these amendments and have them referred to committees, according to the rule, to continuing with the consideration of the appropriation bill.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

MR. McNARY. Let us have it understood the Senator from Arizona is asking unanimous consent temporarily to lay aside the unfinished business, which is the agricultural labor bill, and take up the deficiency appropriation bill. I said I would consent to that, provided he agreed not to present the amendment which has been under discussion and one similar to follow.

MR. HAYDEN. I agree to that.

MR. McNARY. I knew the Senator would agree, but I wanted the Record to show it.

MR. HAYDEN. As chairman of the subcommittee, having been directed by the Committee on Appropriations to present the amendment to the Senate, I felt it my duty to obtain a vote on it. The committee is the servant of the Senate and if a majority of the Senate will not do what the committee wants done, the committee bows to the majority and proceeds according to the will of the majority of the Senate.

MR. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

MR. HAYDEN. I yield.

MR. McCARRAN. The Senator from Oregon made reference to two amendments.

MR. McNARY. Yes.

MR. McCARRAN. One carries an appropriation to take care of children in and about training camps?

MR. HAYDEN. No; the two amendments to which the Senator from Oregon referred are, first, the one which was pending a few moments ago, and the other relates to the High School Victory Corps.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1975) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

CLARIFICATION OF FUNCTIONS OF WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

MR. BAILEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 133) to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 5, and 6, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "Except as provided by Executive Order Numbered 9001-A, December 27, 1941, such a determination may be made by the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, with respect to any vessel title to which has been requisitioned pursuant to the Act of June 6, 1941 (Public Law 101, Seventy-seventh Congress), and which vessel thereafter has been lost or destroyed or converted to naval or military use by the United States, upon owner's consent and certification by the Secretary of State that understanding had been reached between the United States and the diplomatic representatives of the country of which the owner of such vessel was a national, that such title requisition instead of requisition for use was necessitated by the circumstances existing at the date of requisitioning, but that such vessel should be returned after the termination of the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941."; and the Senate agree to the same.

JOSHUA W. BAILEY,
GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
CHAS. L. McNARY,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

S. O. BLAND,
ROBERT RAMSPECK,
J. J. MANSFIELD,
RICHARD J. WELCH,
JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

MR. McNARY. Mr. President, a moment ago the able Senator from New Hampshire [MR. BRIDGES] stated he desired to ask a question or two about this conference report before it should be acted upon. Will the Senator from North Carolina wait a few moments until the Senator from New Hampshire can return to the floor?

MR. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to take advantage of this moment to express the hope that we may proceed without unnecessary delay to dispose of the deficiency appropriation bill, and then proceed without unnecessary delay to dispose of the Bankhead bill. I have a feeling that it is possible to dispose of that measure today, and it is very desirable to do so, in order that the Senate may not be compelled to have a session tomorrow. I had contemplated the Senate adjourning over until Tuesday, if we finish both these bills today, and I still hope that that may be done. I have reason to believe we may be able to do it.

MR. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have obtained the information I wanted, so I have no objection to the Senate proceeding to consider the report.

MR. BAILEY. Mr. President, it is only necessary to say that the House conferees have agreed to the Senate amendment. The Senate receded from the amendment known as No. 1. That was an amendment offered in the committee by the senior Senator from Louisiana [MR. OVERTON], fixing the compensation of attorneys in recoveries against the Shipping Administration on account

of injuries to seamen. I thought it was a good amendment, and so did the Senate conferees. However, there was a demand made for hearings. The demand was made by representatives of labor organizations. I would not like to say that they are opposed to limitation of fees of attorneys in such matters. I think the fees ought to be limited. But we could not agree. I thought it well to recede, with the view to coming back with an independent bill at a later time and providing hearings. So with that amendment stricken out, the bill is as it passed the Senate, with the exception of a little change in the construction of a sentence, which does not change the meaning in any degree.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, may I ask on what ground the House conferees rejected the amendment?

Mr. BAILEY. I undertook to make a statement about it. I do not wish to say anything which would tend to the prejudice of the conferees on the part of the House. We received a great many protests from labor organizations. I received a good many messages myself by wire. I think similar protests were lodged in the House. At any rate the House conferees took the view that since there had been no hearings on this particular phase of the matter, we would really lose nothing by delaying a little while, and coming in with an independent bill, after having given those who wished to be heard an opportunity to be heard.

Certainly I do not subscribe to the view that we ought to add a fifth freedom to the four, and have freedom for shyster lawyers. I supported the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana. But there are a great many important matters in the bill. We have in it provisions with respect to seamen; we have in it a provision giving the Government the right to take 2 months in which to ascertain the condition of ships which it seizes in order to transfer title to charter, and we have in it the matter of compensation for certain ships which were seized by the Government. All those are matters which ought to be provided for regardless of the question of the compensation of attorneys.

I dislike to leave the matter open, but under the circumstances I thought it best to recede. However, I hope to come back some time with a workmen's compensation bill which will provide compensation for those who are injured, and will fix attorneys' fees, but it cannot be done now without encountering a great deal of friction and some delay.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I wish to make the observation that I accede to the statement made by the able Senator from North Carolina. While I am the author of this amendment, yet it was unanimously reported by the Senate Committee on Commerce. It is not a new question. The question of the charges made by shyster attorneys is one which has been before our committee for several years. Charges by shyster attorneys have been outrageous in a great many instances. They have been bleed-

ing the seamen. This is a bill which provides for the institution of action against representatives of the Federal Government, and I thought it was an opportune time, since the Government was directly concerned, to insert such a provision. I am very glad, however, to hear from the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce that this bill will in all probability be followed by some other bill in which such a provision can be inserted, which will do justice to the seamen.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

CAUSES FOR INEQUITIES IN MARKETING OF MEAT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Senate and House Small Business Committees after holding six joint closed sessions in their investigation of the causes of the retail black market in meat and the effect of O. P. A. price and quota regulations on the independent small meat packers, slaughterers and nonslaughterers, wholesalers, and retailers.

In these six closed sessions testimony was presented before the committees by Mr. Prentiss Brown, Price Administrator; Mr. John Madigan, in charge of meat quota rationing; Mr. Charles Elkinton, in charge of meat price ceilings; and Mr. John Hamm, assistant to Mr. Brown, of O. P. A.; Mr. Grover B. Hill, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture; Mr. Charles Hamill, Chief of Small Business Unit of the Department of Justice; Mr. David Podell, Chief of Complaints Section of the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice; and industry members representing the independent packers, slaughterers and nonslaughterers, and wholesalers in the meat industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the small meat industry, including small packers, processors, wholesalers, and retailers, has complained for several months to the Small Business Committees of the House and Senate against various practices imposed upon them by the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture, which threaten to drive them out of business and disrupt the distribution of meat and meat products for essential civilian needs; and

Whereas the Small Business Committees of the House and Senate have held both joint and individual hearings and have otherwise investigated conditions in the meat industry and said committees as a result of said investigations and hearings are persuaded that the small meat industry, including the small packers, processors, wholesalers, and retailers, is in danger of being destroyed; and

Whereas the break-down in the civilian supply of meat and meat products has resulted from the failure of the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture to conform with the express mandate of the Congress in the Second Emergency Price Control Act of October 2, 1942, that "in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural

commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing"; and

Whereas the break-down in the civilian supply of meat and meat products has further resulted from the failure of the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture properly to guide the flow of meat and meat products through the orderly channels of distribution; and

Whereas Public Law 421, Seventy-seventh Congress, known as the Price Control Act, title I, section 2 (a) provides that the Administrator shall "appoint an industry advisory committee, or committees, either national or regional or both, consisting of such number of representatives of the industry as may be necessary in order to constitute a committee truly representative of the industry, or of the industry in such region, as the case may be," and the said section further provides that "the Administrator shall from time to time, at the request of the committee, advise and consult with the committee with respect to the regulation or order, and with respect to the form thereof, and classification, differentiations, and adjustments therein"; and

Whereas the Price Administrator has not exercised said discretionary powers and has not set up such an advisory committee, as suggested in the act, and has not regularly consulted all segments of the meat industry, namely, the large and small slaughterer and nonslaughterer in the packing industry, the large and small processor; the wholesaler, retailer, and consumer; all of which has contributed to the break-down of normal distribution and the destruction of small businesses throughout the country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House Committees on Small Business, That—

1. The Office of Price Administration immediately establish fair and equitable margins between the price of livestock and the price ceilings set on sales of meat and meat products for all processors, packers, wholesalers, and retailers;

2. The Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration immediately establish quotas for nonslaughtering packers as well as slaughtering packers and allocate adequate supplies to the small wholesalers and retailers in all areas of the country, so that when meat rationing is put into effect adequate initial inventories will be held by such packers, processors, wholesalers, and retailers; and

3. The Administrator of the Office of Price Administration immediately proceed to discharge his discretionary powers under the act (Public Law 421, 77th Cong., ch. 26, 2d sess.) by immediately establishing a meat industry advisory committee that will include in its membership equal representation for the large and small slaughterers and nonslaughterers in the packing industry, the large and small processors, the wholesaler, the retailer, and the consumer, which advisory committee shall be regularly consulted by the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture with regard to all new regulations, amendments to existing regulations, directives, orders, or any promulgations with respect to the form thereof and the classifications, and adjustments therein as the same affect the meat industry; and

4. Copies of this resolution be immediately forwarded to the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture and that this committee be advised promptly by the Price Administrator and Secretary of Agriculture of action taken.

Mr. WHERRY. Following the printing of the resolution, I ask to have printed also as a part of my remarks an editorial published in the Journal of Commerce of March 12, 1943, which dis-

cusses in detail the resolution, and which is self-explanatory.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS THREATENS ACTION TO CORRECT MEAT INEQUITIES—SENATE, HOUSE FORECAST STEP UNLESS OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION SETS SLAUGHTERING, NONSLAUGHTERING, PACKER QUOTAS, ALLOCATES SUPPLIES IN PREPARATION FOR RATIONING

WASHINGTON, March 11.—Pointing out that in regulating the meat industry the Office of Price Administration has not observed the Price Control Act, Senate and House Small Business Committees today said they would seek congressional action unless the Office of Price Administration corrects inequities existing in the industry.

The committees adopted a resolution demanding that Office of Price Administration "immediately establish fair and equitable margins between the price of livestock and the price ceilings set on sales of meat and meat products for all processors, packers, wholesalers, and retailers."

QUOTAS ALSO URGED

The resolution also requested the Agriculture Department to join with the Office of Price Administration in establishing quotas for nonslaughtering packers as well as slaughtering packers, and in allocating supplies to the small wholesalers and retailers in all areas of the country so that when meat rationing is made effective, initial inventories will be held by these businesses.

The committees asked Price Administrator Prentiss Brown to establish a meat industry advisory committee, to be composed of all sections of the industry, and that the Office of Price Administration and the Agriculture Department consult this industry before issuing directives and orders, as provided in the Price Stabilization Act.

Mr. Brown has already indicated a desire to establish such a committee.

The small business committees did not recommend how the equitable margins should be established.

After 4 days of hearings and consideration, the Senators and Representatives comprising the two committees minced no words either in their findings or in their expressed determination that action shall no longer be delayed. In this resolution they asserted that the break-down in the civilian supply of meat and meat products has resulted from failure of the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture to conform with the express mandate of the Congress in the Second Emergency Price Control Act of October 2, 1942, that "in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing," and "the break-down in the civilian supply of meat and meat products has further resulted from the failure of the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture properly to guide the flow of meat and meat products through the orderly channels of distribution."

ADMINISTRATOR CRITICIZED

The Price Administrator, says the resolution, has not exercised his discretionary powers to set up an advisory committee, as suggested by the act. Nor has he consulted the large and small slaughterer and nonslaughterer in the packing industry, the large and small processor, the wholesaler, retailer, and consumer. All of this, according to the resolution, has contributed to the break-down of normal distribution and destruction of small business throughout the country.

Members of the committee disclosed that the evidence showed that independent meat

packers were being forced to close their doors, due to losses suffered in the slaughter of hogs and cattle. These losses have ranged from \$2 to \$4 on each hog and from 57 cents to \$3.75 per hundredweight on cattle, according to grades.

Definite action culminated Wednesday morning at the executive session of the two committees on small business when this resolution was adopted calling for specific action to correct a serious condition which threatened the supply of meat for the armed forces and for civilian needs, as also to overcome the shortage of meat existing in various parts of the United States.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION, 1943

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 1975) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] I submit an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, after line 9, it is proposed to insert the following:

CHILDREN'S BUREAU

Grants to States for emergency maternity and infant care: For grants to States, including Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, to provide, in addition to similar services otherwise available, medical, nursing, and hospital maternity and infant care for wives and infants of enlisted men in the armed forces of the United States of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grades, under allotments by the Secretary of Labor and plans developed and administered by State health agencies and approved by the chief of the Children's Bureau, fiscal year 1943, \$1,200,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCarran] questioned Miss Lenroot before the committee with respect to this matter, and I shall ask him to explain the item.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the proposed amendment must also be considered under the rule, and the rule must be suspended in order that the item may be considered. I think the best explanation and the shortest explanation of the necessity for this appropriation comes from the Bureau itself, and with the consent of the Senate I shall read from the hearings. I read from the statement of Katharine F. Lenroot, Chief of the Children's Bureau, as follows:

Senator HAYDEN. There was one Budget estimate that I believe Senator McCARRAN wanted to take up.

Senator McCARRAN. That is the item of the request for \$1,200,000 made in the House, which the House did not see fit to grant. In House Report No. 170 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, page 6, there is the following statement:

"The Budget estimate for grants to States for maternity care of wives and infants of enlisted men of the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh pay ratings of the armed services is a request toward which the committee is very sympathetically inclined. It is one about which there is also urgency in some communities."

I should like to hear what the Bureau or the Department has to say about that item.

Miss LENROOT. This item grew out of a small program started under funds available under part 1, title V, of the Social Security Act, which provides grants to States through State health departments for services for promoting the health of mothers and children.

Senator McCARRAN. This item itself, however, as it comes before this committee and as it came before the House committee, is a new activity?

Miss LENROOT. No, Senator; it is not a new activity, but it is an item that was felt by the House committee not to be covered by basic legislation. Although the amount of money to be appropriated was in excess of that authorized in title V, part 1, of the Social Security Act, the activity is covered by the legislative authority under title V, part 1.

Senator McCARRAN. Why do you feel that you want this item of \$1,200,000, and what will be its results?

Mr. President, I wish to say that in view of the action taken by the Senate with reference to the last two proposed amendments, the amendment now under consideration should have the attention, and the undivided attention, of the Senate at this time. It must not be confused with the last two amendments, which were withdrawn by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden]. The explanation of this amendment in committee is so well made that I am reading it now to the Senate:

Miss LENROOT. Twenty-eight States already have programs for maternity care and care of infants when the father of the infant is in the armed service. There is very great need for this type of care, because the pay for servicemen and noncommissioned officers of the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades is not sufficient to enable a wife to build up any reserve to pay for maternity care. The need, first of all, appeared in the Fort Lewis area, Washington, over a year ago, when the State health department had called to its attention the very difficult plight of these young wives who were not residents of the area and could not get care. The Washington State Health Department asked the Chief of the Children's Bureau to approve an amendment to the plan for maternal and child health services to cover a special maternity-care program in this area. Since the services requested were similar to those already in operation in limited areas in other States under the social-security program, I was glad to approve their proposed plan. In the first year of operation 677 wives of enlisted men have registered for care under this program in the State of Washington. State health officers in many other States soon had similar situations called to their attention. In their annual conference held with the Children's Bureau in the spring of 1942 the State health officers asked the Children's Bureau to set aside some funds from the regular appropriation under the Social Security Act for this specific program.

Mr. President, that tells the story in a brief way. The wives of enlisted men desire to be near their husbands, and thus retain the family unit as closely allied and as closely knit as possible. Young wives go and live near the training camps where their husbands are in training. Nature takes its course, and in due time a baby is born, amidst strange surroundings, in a strange environment, and with no one to take care of the mother. So she is at the mercy of a new community, away from friends, away from relatives, and away from all who

are near and dear to her. It is necessary for the new community to have some assistance from the Federal Government so that it may properly take care of the mother and her infant while the father is in training. That tells the whole story. That is the whole problem.

In view of the emergency and the conditions which have arisen, this amendment should be adopted, even though it is an amendment to a deficiency appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] on page 21, after line 9.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, are we now discussing the Children's Bureau amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought that amendment had been withdrawn.

Mr. HAYDEN. The amendment withdrawn was the one relating to the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services, and to the Victory Corps. The pending amendment relates to the care of wives and children of soldiers who are privates first class, corporals, or sergeants.

Mr. LUCAS. What agency has been in charge of this work up to the present time?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Children's Bureau.

Mr. McCARRAN. As is disclosed by the testimony which I have just read from the head of the Children's Bureau, the work has been carried on only to a very limited extent. However, the necessity for extending the work is growing rapidly.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me propound another question to the Senator in charge of the bill. Is there now in effect legislation which takes care of the situation?

Mr. HAYDEN. The amendment would provide for an expansion of the activities of the Children's Bureau beyond the amount now authorized by law, to be expended for that Bureau. For that reason we have to handle it in this manner. There is a limit fixed by law on the amount of money Congress can appropriate for the Children's Bureau. The amendment would take care of the need by making the appropriation in the way indicated.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, if I correctly understand, the amendment would increase the amount of money which would go to the Children's Bureau.

Mr. HAYDEN. It specifies how the money shall be expended. It is for this purpose only.

Mr. LUCAS. It would in no way change the present legislative set-up so far as the legislative machinery in the administration of this money is concerned?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not at all.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the Senator a further question. Was this amendment considered also in the House of Representatives?

Mr. HAYDEN. I believe it was in the same situation as the other amendment. It was based on a Budget estimate sub-

mitted by the Bureau of the Budget, and inasmuch as it was not favorably reported in the House, the matter was brought to our attention when we wrote the usual letter inquiring of the Department whether there were matters in the Budget not considered by the House. We held a hearing and decided to report to the Senate a recommendation based on the Budget Bureau estimate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] on behalf of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], on page 21, after line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 19, line 5, after the figures "\$140,000", it is proposed to change the comma to a period and to strike out "of which \$25,000 shall be chargeable to the water fund of the District of Columbia, said total appropriation to remain available until June 30, 1944."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a word of explanation might be in order.

There is a provision in the bill charging \$25,000 against the water fund of the District of Columbia. That provision got into the bill in some way in the Bureau of the Budget. It was not requested by the Park Service. The old Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, which runs along the Potomac River into Georgetown, is the property of the Federal Government, and is under the custody and control of the Park Service. For some reason or other a flood which took place some months ago put the old canal out of repair and left it in such condition that it is not now being used.

I am at a loss to know why the District of Columbia should be charged with \$25,000 to repair that canal when it is no part of the property of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia does not receive any benefits from the water which runs through the canal. The use of the water running through the canal is sold by the Park Service to certain industries in Georgetown. The Park Service derives about \$27,000 a year for the use of the water. The District of Columbia does not use the water; and if it did use it the District would be required to pay the Park Service for the use of the water. In my judgment the charge was made against the District of Columbia erroneously, and it should go out of the bill, or at least go to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, ask for a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am introducing bills to be referred to the appropriate legislative committees, covering the two proposals which I was compelled to withdraw by reason of an adverse vote in the Senate.

POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 102, and, out of order, I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may we have the resolution read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution, for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 102) submitted by Mr. GEORGE on February 15, 1943, as heretofore amended, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby established—

(a) A special committee to be known as the Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning (hereinafter referred to as the special committee).

(b) The special committee shall be composed of 10 Members of the Senate, 6 from the majority and 4 from the minority, appointed by the President of the Senate.

(c) It shall be the duty of the special committee to investigate all matters relating to post-war economic policy and problems; to gather information, plans, and suggestions from informed sources with respect to such problems; to study the plans and suggestions received; to report to the Congress from time to time the results of findings made and conclusions reached. It is the sense and purpose of this resolution to make accessible to the Congress, through the special committee, the most complete information respecting post-war economic policy and post-war problems that is available, to the end that Congress may be advised respecting those problems and in a position to formulate solutions with respect to them which will result in the greatest contribution by the Congress to achievement of a stable economy and a just peace. It is intended that full authority to accomplish this general purpose shall be granted by this resolution.

HEARINGS; SUBPENAS; DISBURSEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 2. The special committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold

hearings and to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable, not exceeding the sum of \$—. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of said committee, and shall be served by any person designated by him. Amounts appropriated for the expenses of the committee shall be disbursed by the chairman.

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES; APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION

Sec. 3. The special committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary for the performance of its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation fixed under sections 661-663, 664-673, and 674 of title 5 of the United States Code for comparable duties. Officers and employees of the Government shall be detailed to the service of the special committee on its request, without additional compensation, and such officers and employees shall be paid from the appropriations regularly available for their salaries.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, if the resolution will lead to any extended discussion, I shall object, because the regular order of business is the bill providing for deferment of farm workers.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not believe there will be any serious objection to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the amendment.

The amendment was, on page 2, line 20, after the words "the sum of \$—", to insert "50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (S. DOC. NO. 20)

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, earlier today I presented to the Vice President an additional report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, which he laid before the Senate and the report was ordered to be printed as a document. I now ask that the report be printed in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, to what does the report relate?

Mr. BYRD. It relates to regional agricultural credit corporations.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to register my personal protest to the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by saying that I think all members of the committee should have an opportunity to see these reports before they are filed with the Senate. I have not seen this report. I am only a humble member of the committee, but I wish to say that I strenuously object to this procedure. This is not the first time it has occurred.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee will be very glad to furnish the Senator from Wisconsin

with a copy of the report. Meetings were held on 2 days on this question, and the Senator from Wisconsin was invited to be present, but so far as I know, he indicated no interest. We heard nothing whatever from him. The other members of the committee gave the fullest possible consideration to the matter, and attended long hearings. I assume that if the Senator from Wisconsin had been interested he would have so indicated.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am in the unfortunate position of being a member of a number of committees. Perhaps I should resign from all except the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. However, Mr. President, it is a matter of common courtesy and practice so far as committees are concerned, to submit reports of committees to individual members before the reports are filed. If this were the first time that such a thing had happened, I would not have any objection, but it happens continually with this committee.

It is true that I was not able to be present. When I am not able to be present at the meetings of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I shall try to read the testimony taken at the hearings, just as when I am not able to be present at meetings of the Finance Committee or of some other committee because of a conflict with some other meeting which I am required to attend, I endeavor to read the testimony taken at the hearings held by those committees.

I am not able to be in more than one place at a time. It may be that I shall be in full agreement with the report. I do not know. I merely wish to say that, since the report is filed in the name of the committee, if no exception is taken at the time when it is filed, there is an indication that the entire membership of the committee is in sympathy and accord with the report. Although when I have an opportunity to read the report, I may find that I am in complete sympathy and accord with the views expressed in it, under the present circumstances I am not sure that I shall be.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, let me say that when many reports are made copies are not sent to members of the committee who were absent during the hearings or during consideration of the report by the committee. I do not think the chairman of the committee is guilty of any violation of ethics when he makes a report in this instance.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think that members of the committee should have an opportunity to read the report before it is filed, in case they might disagree or wish to take exception to any part of it or to file a minority report. The committee is an investigating committee, Mr. President. Ordinarily it holds all its hearings in camera—in executive session—and then files its report.

Mr. BYRD. I must correct the Senator, Mr. President. Many of the meetings of the committee are held in open session. The Senator from Wisconsin

has not been able to attend the meetings, and of course is not familiar with what has been done.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am familiar with what has been done. Some of the meetings are held in executive session, and then a report is filed and the general public or the Members of the House and the Senate never have any way of knowing upon what evidence the report is based.

Let me say that I am not asking for any unusual treatment. The treatment I request is no different from that which I have received from any other investigating committee of which I have been a member. I merely wish to enter this statement on the record so that my position in the matter will be clear.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to say a further word in defense of the Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield further to the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Let me say that when the committee holds public meetings a stenographic report is made of all the testimony taken. When we have executive meetings—as does every committee of the Senate; I do not know of any Senate committee which does not have executive meetings when it decides on reports to be made to the Senate—at that time a stenographic transcript is made of the proceedings, and is available to the committee.

I deeply regret that the Senator from Wisconsin, due to his other duties, has not been able to attend the meetings of the committee. It would be very profitable to the Senate and to the country if the Senator could attend them. If the Senator is interested at any time in any of the matters considered by the committee, I shall be delighted to present to him all the evidence and all the information available.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, all I ask is that at the time when the Senator, the chairman of the committee, files his report which purports to put the entire membership of the committee on record as having drawn certain conclusions from the testimony taken either in executive session or in public hearings, the chairman of the committee have a copy of the hearings furnished to all members of the committee, so that if they find themselves to be in disagreement with all or any part of the views expressed in it they may have an opportunity to state their positions or to file minority views if they desire to do so. I do not think such a request is an unusual or unreasonable one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, in accordance with the request of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The report is as follows:

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE, AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
In accordance with title 6 of the Revenue Act of 1941, Public Law 250, Seventy-seventh

Congress, an additional report herewith is presented by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 6, Seventy-eighth Congress, introduced by Senator KENNETH WHERRY on February 1, 1943, was referred to the committee by the President of the Senate.

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

"Whereas on January 23, 1943, the Secretary of Agriculture in a formal release stated that through the Food Production Administration 5-percent 1-year agricultural loans would be made available to farmers to provide funds to aid war food growing, that \$225,000,000 was available for that purpose, that this program was not a substitute for other sources of credit or intended to compete with other lenders, but that its purpose was to supplement such other sources of credit where needed and that producers were to be urged to obtain their financial requirements, if possible, from other sources; and

"Whereas there is already in operation the Production Credit Corporation, a governmental lending agency which provides, on a commercial basis, agricultural loans in direct competition with private enterprise, and also in operation the Farm Security Administration, a governmental agency which provides credit to eligible farmers who desire to rehabilitate themselves on the land, both of which were created to provide funds for farmers, that they might produce agricultural products; and

"Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture has stated that the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation (formerly known as the "Barnyard Loan Agency"), is to be revived as another Government-subsidized lending agency, to be financed out of public funds, where there is already in operation the Production Credit Corporation and the Farm Security Administration which have similar functions; and

"Whereas it is believed the functions and activities of such Government-subsidized lending agencies could be appropriately handled, through available facilities of private lending agencies, without detriment to agriculture or impairment of all-out agricultural production, inasmuch as private lending agencies now have available money to make agricultural loans without reviving any governmental lending agency, without unnecessary governmental expenditures, and without competition with private enterprise or prejudice to private lending agencies; and

"Whereas a consolidation of the agricultural lending agencies of the Government, or a proper correlation of their functions, activities, and services with those of private lending agencies, should provide the same equivalent service to agriculture as is now being provided by such Government-subsidized lending agencies, and would not result in loss to the agricultural producer but would benefit him, would eliminate unnecessary agencies, would conserve public funds, would eliminate duplicity, would release and provide needed manpower and materials for other lines of endeavor, and would be feasible: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures created by section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941 is hereby requested, in connection with the investigations provided for by such section 601, to investigate the need for the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation and its reestablishment, to determine whether the making available of \$225,000,000 of public moneys for lending purposes is an essential or nonessential ex-

penditure and to determine whether the consolidation of all agricultural lending agencies of the Government, or the correlation of the functions of such agencies with the services of private lending agencies, would result in the conservation of public moneys and release manpower and materials to other essential activities."

INTRODUCTION

In order to present a complete picture of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations in their relation to the Federal agricultural lending policy, it will first be necessary to trace briefly the creation and history of these organizations followed by a description of their operation and personnel. Testimony by farmers, merchants, and bankers given at the hearings held by the committee will then be presented. Following this, the report will show that there is widespread duplication in the various lending and credit organizations of the Department of Agriculture. The probability of future evils emanating from Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation program will then be explored and conclusions and recommendations made.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee make the following recommendations:

1. That the Department of Agriculture immediately discontinue the lending activities of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan program.
2. That Congress consider legislation providing for the immediate liquidation of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations, and that all funds not needed in the liquidation of such corporations be returned immediately to the Treasury of the United States.
3. That the Secretary of Agriculture immediately advise Congress as to how the various lending agencies of the Department of Agriculture can best simplify and consolidate their activities, in order to prevent duplication and overlapping in the power to loan funds, thereby reducing to a minimum the personnel engaged in such lending activities as well as the cost of administration.
4. That the Congress enlarge the statutory authority of the emergency crop and feed loan program of the Farm Credit Administration, which is already in existence, in order to provide credit for farmers when such a need is required in furtherance of the war food-production program. Senate bill 715 is now before the Senate Agriculture Committee.
5. That the Secretary of Agriculture immediately issue a regulation requiring that the various agricultural lending agencies discontinue the solicitation of borrowers.
6. The Committee express the hope that existing private banking institutions will make available agricultural loans at interest rates as low as possible consistent with the nature of the security pledged therefor.

NEW CREDIT FACILITIES WILL NOT SOLVE THE FARMER'S PROBLEM

After careful consideration of all the facts, the committee is forced to the inescapable conclusion that an increased production of food is not dependent upon new sources of credit. The farmer's vital need is manpower and machinery. The following analysis shows that the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations are nonessential and, in effect, are duplicating the lending activities of other Federal agricultural lending agencies.

The committee does not believe that a sufficient attempt was made to use existing agencies. Concomitantly the committee does believe that it is unnecessary to revive an agency for the purpose of making available funds when existing agencies might well perform the needed duties.

HISTORY OF THE REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CORPORATION

In 1932 the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations were created under the Emergency Relief and Construction Act to supply farmers with short-term credit which at that time and for several years thereafter was necessary for their existence.

In 1932 the total cash farm income in the United States was \$4,743,000,000 (including Federal aid) and the total deposits available for loans in the banks of the United States amounted to \$36,000,000,000. Latest figures show that for 1942 the total farm income was \$16,100,000,000 (including Federal aid) and \$88,000,000,000 was estimated to have been on deposit and available for lending purposes in the banks of the United States. This comparison shows that during the 10-year period from 1932 through 1942 farm income had increased about 240 percent and money available for loans in the banks of the United States had increased 144 percent. (See appendix 2.)

For several years after the creation of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations they functioned in accordance with the provisions of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932. (See appendix 5.) The language of that statute is clear and unequivocal in stating that the Secretary of Agriculture shall make loans or advances only "in cases where he finds that an emergency exists, as a result of which farmers are unable to obtain loans for crop production during the year 1932," and in other cases where it was necessary to make "loans or advances to farmers who suffered from crop failures in 1931."

On March 27, 1933, pursuant to Executive Order 6084, the supervisory functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation over the activities and functions of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations were transferred to the Farm Credit Administration, and the activities of such Corporation were curtailed because of the scope and short-term financing powers of the production credit associations and the Farm Security Administration.

On September 30, 1937, the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, of Washington, D. C., was created by the Farm Credit Administration through a reorganization by the merger of five regional agricultural credit corporations which had been dormant for about 3 years, with a total capitalization of \$44,500,000.

On January 23, 1943, the Secretary of Agriculture stated that the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation program was to be revived, and through the Food Production Administration approximately \$225,000,000 of Federal funds were to be available to farmers on a 1-year short-term basis at 5 percent.

OPERATION AND ACTIVITY OF REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CORPORATIONS

Evidence adduced at the hearings show that this new program is administered by the Farm Credit Administration of the Department of Agriculture, whose agents are located in more than 3,000 counties throughout the United States. The capital investment of \$44,500,000 in the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., is being utilized as the initial sum in inaugurating a general loan program involving two types of credit, namely F-1 and F-2 loans. (See appendix 6.)

Generally speaking, F-1 loans are made to those engaged in agricultural pursuits in amounts varying from \$1 to \$25,000, depending upon the type of pursuit and purpose for which the money is to be used. Loans are limited to \$7,500 to each borrower, except in the case of a dairy farmer, who may obtain as high as \$10,000, and a livestock producer, who may obtain as high as \$25,000. Usually F-2 loans are made to those engaged in agri-

cultural pursuits, who undertake, during the crop year 1943, the production of 18 designated essential war crops. These special war-crop advances will be made in amounts ranging from \$1 to \$7,500 for most any purpose directly or indirectly connected with the production of these crops.

CREDIT BY PYRAMIDING

The financial activities of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan program are operated by the utilization of the \$44,500,000 capital investment of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, of Washington, D. C. By borrowing from or rediscounting with other lending institutions, principally the Federal Intermediate credit banks, the corporation can then obtain loan funds of from between \$200,000,000 and \$225,000,000. In addition, the various regional agricultural credit corporations reestablished throughout the United States have authority to borrow from or rediscount with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Federal Intermediate credit banks.

PERSONNEL OF THE REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CORPORATIONS

The committee devoted considerable attention to the matter of how the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation was to function, in view of the fact it appeared to be a new agency with employees and necessary clerical help in more than 3,000 counties throughout the United States. In each county loans are now being solicited and made by two Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation representatives. These two persons are usually the chairman of the county war board and one designated county loan agent of the Department of Agriculture. The chairman of the county war board is, in most instances the chairman of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency committee for the county. The county loan representative may be an employee selected from either the Production Credit Association, National Farm Loan Association, Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Organization, Commodity Credit Corporation, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, or Farm Security Administration.

The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation appoints a loan representative from the membership of the county war board, which comprises employees of each of the bureaus of the Department of Agriculture operating in the county. After being appointed this loan representative is then selected by the county war board to work with the chairman of the war board in performing the functions of the lending program.

In each case applicants for Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loans will be directed to appear before the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation's agents in the applicant's county, who will consider the advisability of making such loans, and either approve or disapprove them. Their decision is final in most cases. Where a loan is approved funds are advanced thereon by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. The paper is sent to either the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or the Federal Reserve bank for discount.

Representatives of the Department of Agriculture stated at the hearing that in operating the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation program, additional personnel would not be required. It seemed to be the intention of the Department to use employees of the production credit associations, Farm Security Administration, and Agricultural Adjustment Administration. Under this plan for borrowing personnel, the Farm Credit Administration would reimburse the various bureaus of the Department of Agriculture for the services of these employees. From this it is clear that the agencies, from which

in excess of 3,000 employees will be borrowed, either have surplus employees and are over-staffed or will need to hire additional employees to supplant those loaned the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation program.

The testimony reveals that the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan program is already in operation in 742 counties throughout the United States. A number of loans have already been made by the 742 county war board chairmen (Agricultural Adjustment Administration men), the 725 production credit associations men, and the 688 Farm Security Administration supervisors, who have thus far been appointed by the Farm Credit Administration and selected by the county war boards, respectively, as local representatives to solicit loans and carry out the purposes of this recently inaugurated Government loan activity.

DUPLICATION OF LENDING ACTIVITIES OF EMERGENCY CROP AND FEED LOAN PROGRAM, PRODUCTION CREDIT ASSOCIATION LOAN PROGRAM, REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CORPORATION LOAN PROGRAM, AND THE FARM SECURITY RURAL REHABILITATION LOAN PROGRAM

A. Production credit corporations and associations

The Farm Credit Act of 1933 authorized the establishment of 12 production credit corporations, 1 in each farm credit district, and 1 each at the locale of each credit association. The system as established provides credit for all types of farm and ranch operations. Applications for loans may be made to the local production credit associations and to their field office representatives in the various counties in each State.

Local production credit associations, which are cooperative organizations of farmers and stockmen, make and collect the loans. The associations are supervised generally and capitalized partially by the production credit corporations. All voting stock in a production credit association is owned by its member-borrowers, who elect the directors from their number at their annual stockholders' meeting. Each stockholder has one vote regardless of the number of shares he owns. The directors elect the officers and the executive committee and also hire the employees.

The present annual interest rate in the continental United States is 4.5 percent and in Puerto Rico it is 5 percent. Loans are usually made for less than \$50 and for a year period. The unpaid balance of certain types of loans may be renewed for a further period if the credit factors are satisfactory.

B. Emergency crop and feed loan program

The regulations of the Farm Credit Administration, Department of Agriculture, governing emergency crop and feed loans, provide that the amount which may be loaned to any one borrower during the year shall not exceed \$400, and that preference is to be given to farmers whose cash requirements are small. No loan will be made for an amount less than the sum of \$10, and all loans will be made in multiples of 5. Notes bear interest, from maturity until paid, at the rate of 4 percent per year, and interest to the maturity date at the same rate will be deducted at the time the loan is made. Emergency crop and feed loans are made only to applicants who are unable to procure from other sources loans in amounts reasonably adequate to meet their needs. Farmers who have adequate security ordinarily are able to obtain needed funds from local production credit associations, banks, and individuals.

C. Rural rehabilitation loan program of Farm Security Administration

When the Resettlement Administration was transferred to the Department of Agriculture by Executive Order No. 7530, dated

December 31, 1936, its name was changed to the Farm Security Administration in accordance with the secretary's memorandum of September 1, 1937.

Under the Farm Security Administration's rural rehabilitation loan program, nearly 1,000,000 low-income farm families have been aided by loans for the purchase of farm and home supplies, machinery, equipment, livestock, seed, feed, and fertilizer needed for a fresh start on a sounder basis, for the refinancing of indebtedness and for family subsistence.

Rural rehabilitation loans are limited to families unable to obtain adequate operating credit at reasonable terms from any other source and are repayable in 1 to 5 years at an interest rate of 5 percent.

The standard borrowers, numbering approximately 650,000, receive technical guidance and supervision from county farm and home management supervisors. The standard loans are accompanied by a farm and home management plan which the borrower family works out with the cooperation of the county supervisors and which provides for home production and preservation of food and feed, diversification of farm enterprises, crop rotation, and soil-conservation and soil-building practices.

Nonstandard rural rehabilitation loans are made to small farmers for emergency purposes, usually in stricken farm areas. Nonstandard borrowers number approximately 330,000. A farm and home-management plan is not required on this type of loan.

Small grants, for subsistence only, in return for which poverty-stricken families do specified work on their farms or public lands are made in cases of urgent need.

Under the community and cooperative services program, loans are also available to low-income farmers to organize small informal cooperatives through which they can jointly own and operate essential farm equipment.

Since the entrance of the United States into war, the Farm Security Administration has instituted a special "Food For Freedom" loan for rural families on tracts of land too small for regular farm operation to enable them to participate in the Nation's war effort by increasing production of food, both for home use and for the market. Loans to boys and girls of low income farm families for club projects also are a part of the program to increase food and fiber production for war needs on the small farms of the country.

D. Comparison

Already in existence, conceivably, for identical, similar, or related purposes in the field of agricultural credit are the lending facilities of 20 agencies of the Federal Government. (See Appendix 3.) Three of these agencies, with separate staffs and administrations independent of each other, are now making and have been making loans identical in character with those of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan program, and similar in most all respects to the commercial type loans of private lending institutions.

The committee is concerned with the overlapping and duplicating activities in which the recently reestablished Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan program is now engaged with respect to these particular loan agencies of the Federal Government which have been in operation for the past 5 or 10 years. The three lending agencies referred to, all in the United States Department of Agriculture, are (1) the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section of the Farm Credit Administration, (2) the Production Credit Associations of the Farm Credit Administration, and (3) the Rural Rehabilitation Loan Section of the Farm Security Administration.

The loan purposes of the newly reorganized and reestablished Regional Agricultural

Credit Corporation's loan program and those of these three agencies are similar in most, if not all, respects. The purpose of advances in each instance are the same, namely, for crop production and for such other purposes as are directly or indirectly connected with the production of agricultural commodities.

The loan limits of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation program are from \$1 to \$7,500 for most purposes, from \$1 to \$10,000 in the case of dairy production, and from \$1 to \$25,000 in the case of livestock production. Those of the emergency crop and feed-loan program are from \$10 to \$400; those of the production credit associations \$50 and up; rural rehabilitation loan limits, similarly, are from \$1 up.

The term for loans advanced by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section, and the production credit associations is, in each instance, 1 year. Farm Security Administration's rural rehabilitation loans run from 1 to 5 years.

Interest rates of the emergency crop and feed loans and the Production Credit Association loans are 4 percent and 4.5 percent, respectively, while those of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation's loan program and the rural rehabilitation loan program are 5 percent per annum.

Security on all types of loans under each of these four programs is the same; that is, it consists of a lien on the crop, livestock, feed, or equipment, and, in addition, the borrower is subject to unlimited personal liability.

Investigation shows that, as a practical matter, the conditions of commercial type loans made to farmers by more than 21,000 country banks have been most liberal. The purposes for which this credit is extended to farmers is identical with the loan purposes of Federal agricultural lending agencies. (See appendix 6.) The interest rates charged by these institutions vary from 3 to 6 percent, depending upon the current rate in effect in the particular Federal Reserve district. On the other hand, the interest rates of the Federal agricultural lending agencies vary from 4 to 5 percent. Usually, the loan term of the commercial type credit advanced by country banks is the crop season, which varies from 6 months to 1 year. Correspondingly, the loan term of Federal agricultural lending agencies is 1 year. Loan limits of country bank members of the Federal Reserve System for the purposes under consideration extend up to 10 percent of the capital and surplus of the particular banking institution, whereas the loan limits of Federal agricultural lending agencies (outlined in appendix 6) extends from \$1 to \$25,000. In both cases the security for the loan is the same, namely, a lien on the crop or chattels of the farmer, and unlimited personal liability; qualified only by the practical consideration that in the case of loan defaults the private banking institutions will probably exercise their legal rights more promptly.

E. Solicitation by regional agricultural credit corporations

Further, in considering the competition given the country banks by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation program there was ample evidence that the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan representatives were actively engaged in soliciting loans, through a concentrated publicity campaign, utilizing the radio and press. Although the representative of the Department of Agriculture denied this, exhibits introduced at the hearings and the testimony of several witnesses shows conclusively that the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation pro-

gram was being widely advertised in an attempt to induce farmers to utilize Government credit, and no attempt was being made to save this credit for those farmers who were unable to secure credit from the country banks.

FUTURE ASPECTS

During the course of the hearings and investigation into the need for the reestablishment of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan program on a large scale in every county throughout the United States, there were many instances in the testimony and facts which pointed to the possibility that the easy lending habits of Farm Security's rural rehabilitation loan representatives (appointed by the Farm Credit Administration and selected by the county war boards as loan agents of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation program) would gradually permeate the whole Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan program. The testimony revealed that thus far, 688 Farm Security Administration supervisors have already been appointed by the Farm Credit Administration and selected by the county war boards to assist in passing on loans made under the newly reorganized Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan program. One witness feared that, eventually, when the rural rehabilitation loan program of the Farm Security Administration was abolished, or even before that time, it would gradually be transformed into the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan program. Thus, rural rehabilitation loan credit would continue to be dispensed on terms so advantageous to the borrower that the Government would be left without security and suffer heavy financial losses by reason of default.

TESTIMONY OF FARMERS, MERCHANTS, AND BANKERS

Representative American bankers testified that there was absolutely no useful purpose to be served by reviving the regional agricultural credit corporations. In part they state their position as follows:

"It is recognized that direct relief by the Government in times of serious economic stress may involve some granting of loans from public funds as a temporary emergency expedient. However, the continued practice in making uneconomic loans from public funds, without adequate consideration of the ability of the borrower to repay and with the losses socialized at the expense of the taxpayers violates the principles on which credit rests and thereby endangers the foundation of a sound credit structure.

"We recognize the right of farmers or any other group to establish, operate, and maintain cooperative credit enterprises. We believe, however, that such institutions should be operated on a self-supporting basis and that income should be adequate to cover the costs of operation, including credit losses. Continuing losses of any such institutions should not be subsidized out of the Federal Treasury.

"The chartered commercial and savings banks of the Nation represent the largest source of all agricultural production credit. In the present emergency the banks in financing war production, are ready and anxious to further marshal their resources to serve the Nation's credit needs in support of food-for-freedom in 1943."

This statement of policy was implemented by the testimony of bankers from both urban and rural communities, who pointed out that since both farm income and available credit in private lending institutions (banks) had increased tremendously within the past 10 years (see appendix 2), it was difficult to believe that the bottleneck today was caused by

lack of credit. They were of the opinion that the Secretary of the Treasury shared this viewpoint.

The testimony of these witnesses showed that the revival of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, which is in addition to the 19 agricultural loan agencies already in existence (see appendix 3), would result in such competition with the country banks as to hinder their effectiveness in the sale of War bonds and stamps. They explained that the banks could ill afford to compete with a Government loan agency specializing in short-term financing at an interest rate much below that which the banks were forced to charge and still render the public services which they were called upon to do by the Secretary of the Treasury. In addition to this, they pointed out that the Government, with \$225,000,000, will be embarking upon a precarious fiscal venture, which will encourage speculation.

It was shown that to date the banks of the United States have sold 85 percent of all the Defense and War Savings bonds and stamps and have made approximately 80 percent of all loans to farmers for the purpose of producing food.

These witnesses explained in no uncertain terms that the real problem with which the farmer was faced today was not lack of credit but lack of manpower and farm machinery. It was pointed out facetiously that, given all the credit possible, a dirt farmer cannot plant, cultivate, or harvest his crops without adequate manpower and farm machinery.

On February 17, 1943, several farmers from the midwestern and southern areas testified in complete unanimity regarding the activities of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations, believing that at this time a revival of that loaning agency would be wasteful and nonessential to the war program. These witnesses stated that a farmer is entitled to loans from many other similar agencies in the Department of Agriculture and that this additional lending agency would provide credit for the poor risks which in effect would result in the Government's losing rather than gaining in the long run, both from the standpoint of the effectiveness of the program and the security with which it would be reimbursed.

These witnesses were concerned by the methods to be used by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations and believed that the pyramiding of \$44,500,000 to \$225,000,000 was a precarious business policy which would injure the financial structure of the country. They were agreed that the farmer needs farm labor and machinery, but certainly not credit.

In the conduct of the hearings and during the investigation into the matters herein considered, the committee was fortunate in having the services and cooperation of the junior Senator from Nebraska, Hon. KENNETH WHERRY. He furnished the committee with scores of letters from farmers all over the United States. Without exception these letters and those received by the committee expressed disapproval at the reestablishment of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations. Specifically, the farmers believed that there was a sufficient number of agricultural loan agencies at the present time. One farmer from Rupert, Idaho, states, "There's no more need for this new loaning bureau than a hog has for a shotgun."

CONCLUSIONS

1. The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan program was created during the emergency of 1932 and 1933 in order to extend credit to farmers in the midst of a national drought. This particular credit

emergency no longer exists. (See Appendix 5.)

2. The revival of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan program duplicates wholly or partially the lending activities of 19 other Federal agricultural lending agencies performing identical, similar, or related functions. (See appendix 3.)

3. The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation's loan program, by soliciting credit where the field is drastically limited, is depriving private lending institutions and country banks of their normal loan business.

4. The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation's loan program may weaken the structure of over 11,000 country banks, which are carrying a great burden of the food-for-freedom program, and the direction of and collections from War bond sales in their respective communities throughout the United States.

5. The full and complete operation of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation in the wartime field of credit and in the war food-growing effort will impede rather than increase the production of food.

6. The greatest obstacle to the attainment of food production goals in 1943 will not be lack of credit from another Government bureau but the diminishing supply of manpower available for work on the farms and the lack of farm machinery.

7. The services of the more than 3,000 full- and part-time employees who will be required in the administration of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation could be put to better use in some other phase of the war program.

8. The system for county clearance of loans under the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation program is not based on sound business principles. It will foster loose lending practices and speculation, which will be chaotic to the national war food-growing effort.

9. In reestablishing the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan program on such a large scale, it is evident that the Farm Credit Administration deemed it necessary to extend credit to farmers. (See appendix 4.) However, the committee was unable to find any evidence which indicated that more than a cursory investigation was made by the Farm Credit Administration of this problem.

APPENDIX 1

Statement by KENNETH S. WHERRY, Senator from Nebraska; statements of farmer witnesses, and excerpts from letters received from farmers.

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, who introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 6 made a statement to the committee relative to the history and operations of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, which in part is as follows:

"If you will just give me a moment or two, Mr. Chairman, I would like to state something about the old Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, because I am very well acquainted with it. It was originally established under the Hoover administration and was brought into existence at a time when the private lending agencies did not have money. We had had a drought. We had had a depression, many banks were low on deposits, and it was created by the administration at that time. It was set up by men who had had experience in lending money, and it did help the private lending agencies over the hill. It really served a very useful purpose. It was one organization that was well managed, well handled, and it provided the means whereby not only farmers got their money direct from the Government lending agency but it also helped the private lending

agencies to withstand collapse because money was available from the Government. It continued to operate up until, as I recall it, about 1933, maybe the early part of 1934. That organization has not been liquidated, it still is a skeleton organization, but its usefulness and its purpose was terminated, almost, I would call it, self-terminated, because the private lending agencies began to get money, we got over the drought, we got crops, we got better prices. In 1933 or early 1934 the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation was practically liquidated because the farmers once again borrowed their money from private lending agencies. That is why it went out of the picture.

"At that time the private lending agencies had about \$36,000,000,000 on hand. I think there was no need at that time for the Production Credit Association to continue the work, because the money was available. At that time, I want you to know that the private lending agencies of this country had \$36,000,000,000 on deposit, and now they have \$86,000,000,000 on deposit. That is available to farmers of this country. If the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation was not necessary in 1934, with \$36,000,000,000, it is my opinion that it is not needed now when the private lending agencies have \$86,000,000,000 on hand.

"Now, here is another thought. I believe that the chief bottleneck in the production of food is manpower. I am satisfied from the many, many letters I receive that the chief concern in the production of food is manpower. If you reestablish the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation you set up a new bureau, and that takes manpower. If you make these loans available, if you go out and solicit farmers to go on the land other than are now solicited by the Farm Security Agency, you simply take away from the farmer the hired man and put him in business for himself, where, if you leave him where he is, on a good farm, the chances are he will produce more of a surplus than he would if you give him the source of getting money from the reestablishment of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. In other words, from a manpower point of view you do not gain anything; in fact, you lose, and putting a farmer under the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation merely doubles what you are already doing, and I think would limit food production rather than increase it."

The committee received in evidence from Senator WHERRY many letters relating to this resolution and excerpts from some of these are as follows:

"We are opposed to the unfairness of the subsidized competition and we see no reason for a duplication of loaning services at a time when the country banks are able and willing to finance agriculture." (F. J. Poepl, Vermillion, Minn.)

"Heretofore anyone seeking a loan from the Farm Security Administration office had to furnish a letter stating that the bank could not make the loan. * * * Under the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation plan such would not be the case and they would solicit loans from everyone needing funds. This puts them in direct competition with banks." (F. R. Kingsbury, Ponca, Nebr.)

"At a time when country banks are able and more than willing to fully finance agriculture, I see no sense in trying to duplicate the loaning services of these banks." (A. G. Berthot, Bozeman, Mont.)

"* * * Glad to note that you are introducing a resolution to investigate the many and various farm credit set-ups of our Federal Government. These institutions offering socialized credit cost the taxpayers

very much more than their worth to the farmers." (Percy E. Heald, Chester, Vt.)

"We oppose Government credit of all kinds for crop production. Banks here begging for crop loans." (Canton, Miss., Flora, Miss.)

"It is my opinion that in the main, banks not only can but will be glad to take care of the credit in their own community." (Richard McMullen, Stella, Nebr.)

"For I want to tell you, as a man who was reared on a farm and has known intimately the agricultural situation in the Southeastern States for more than 40 years, that not only this but many of the other Federal lending agencies are absolutely unnecessary. In addition, their advantages, in that they do not have stockholders to account to and have taxpayers to pay their expenses and subsidize their operations, are rapidly allowing them to put the capitalistic system of finance, commerce, agriculture, and industry out of business." (H. Land Young, Atlanta, Ga.)

"Not only are you on the right track in connection with this particular agency (Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation) but also in general, as it is certainly time these useless and expensive bureaus in Government be weeded out and that as far as possible private industry care for the needs of the people." (M. W. Dunlap, Douglas, Nebr.)

"It is certainly time for Congress to give consideration—for if something is not done to stop the organization of Government agencies in the field of finance, we will be completely socialized in 3 or 4 more years—it is simply ridiculous for anyone to say that it is necessary to set up an agency to make loans of this type. The banks of our country are loaded with money and are seeking loans from every direction, so why set up an organization of this kind. It seems to me that many of these organizations are created to give a lot of people jobs." (C. R. Bell, Anniston, Ala.)

"There certainly is no sense in trying to duplicate the loaning services of country banks at a time when banks are able and more than willing to fully finance agriculture." (Fred L. Zacharias, Blue Island, Ill.)

Several farmers from the agricultural areas of the United States testified before the committee.

Mr. C. D. Haskell, a dirt farmer of Laurel, Nebr., stated that the farmers in his locality are doing everything they can to produce food, and that "farm credit was not a bottleneck but that the real trouble would come through the lack of manpower and farm machinery." Mr. Haskell said that his son "has had an application in now for a 15 foot disk for 8 months and he has not been able to get it."

Mr. L. M. Walker, Jr., commissioner of agriculture, State of Virginia, testified that there was no need of another agricultural credit agency to extend credit to farmers; that what the farmer needed was manpower and machinery for the year 1943, and in answer to questioning by members of the committee stated, "I can see how it would pull a man off a well-managed farm, managed by the owner, and put him on inferior land with cheap money, where he would be taking a chance," and added, "I can see no good in it for Virginia farmers."

Mr. Albert S. Goss, national master of the Grange, reviewed in some detail the organization and the operations of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. He stated that in his opinion there was no need for another Federal credit agency. Mr. Goss stated:

"The stand of the Grange is that we do not believe the problem today is one of credit. Our problems are labor, equipment, and in some few commodities, price. The Grange

does not believe in Government lending, except in the case of an emergency where no other source of credit is available and credit is absolutely necessary. We do not think that those conditions prevail today. * * *

"We believe in both cooperative and private credit, and that the rates of interest charged and the terms of the loans should be such as to make the loans self-supporting."

Mr. Ralph W. Moore, representing the State commissioner of agriculture of Texas, testified that credit is available; that lack of agricultural manpower is a problem, as are farm prices without taking into consideration the cost of production. Mr. Moore was of the opinion that "the greatest waste of manpower is the United States Government itself" and that the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation "is just another plan to further control and regiment the farmers."

APPENDIX 2.—Comparative tables showing relation between total bank deposits and total farm income annually from 1932 to 1942

Year	Total bank deposits, income, United States (includes inter-bank deposits)	Total cash farm income (includes Federal aid)
1932	\$45,390,269,000	\$4,743,000,000
1933	41,533,470,000	5,445,000,000
1934	46,625,041,000	6,780,000,000
1935	51,586,123,000	7,659,000,000
1936	58,339,815,000	8,654,000,000
1937	59,822,370,000	9,217,000,000
1938	59,379,550,000	8,168,000,000
1939	64,576,694,000	8,634,000,000
1940	71,153,458,000	9,145,000,000
1941	78,549,329,000	11,830,000,000
1942	102,000,000,000	16,100,000,000

¹ \$36,000,000,000 estimated available for lending purposes.

² \$88,000,000,000 estimated available for lending purposes.

APPENDIX 3

The following is a list of the 20 Government agencies engaged in lending Federal funds for agricultural purposes.

1. Central Bank for Cooperatives.
2. Commodity Credit Corporation.
3. Disaster Loan Corporation.
4. District Banks for Cooperatives.
5. Electric Home and Farm Authority.
6. Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section.
7. Farm Credit Administration.
8. Farm Security Administration.
9. Federal Credit Unions.
10. Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.
11. Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.
12. Federal Intermediate Credit Banks.
13. Federal Land Banks.
14. Land Bank Commissioner Loans.
15. National Farm Loan Associations.
16. Production Credit Associations.
17. Production Credit Corporations.
18. Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration.
19. Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations.
20. Rural Electrification Administration.

APPENDIX 4

Regional agricultural credit corporations (12 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 1148, et seq.)

Sec. 1148. Regional agricultural credit corporations: Creation; capital; management; loans; rediscuts; supervision: "The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to create in any of the 12 farm credit districts where it may deem the same to be desirable a regional agricultural credit corporation with a paid-up capital of not less than \$3,000,000. to be subscribed for by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and paid for out of the unexpended balance of the amounts

allocated and made available to the Secretary of Agriculture under section 602 of title 15. Such corporations shall be managed by the officers and agents to be appointed by the Farm Credit Administration under such rules and regulations as it may prescribe. Such corporations are hereby authorized and empowered to make loans and advances to farmers and stockmen, the proceeds of which are to be used for an agricultural purpose (including crop production), or for the raising, breeding fattening, or marketing of livestock, to charge such rates of interest or discount thereon as in their judgment are fair and equitable, subject to the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, and to rediscunt with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the various Federal Reserve banks and Federal intermediate credit banks any paper that they acquire which is eligible for such purpose. All expenses incurred in connection with the operation of such corporations shall be supervised and paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under such rules and regulations as its board of directors may prescribe" (12 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 1148, approved July 21, 1932, 47 Stat. 713; 50 Stat. 704).

Sec. 1148a. Reduction of capital stock of Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation; revolving fund from stock proceeds: "The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized, with the approval of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, to reduce the capital of any Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation by such action as may be suitable for the purpose. The funds made available by any such reduction shall constitute a revolving fund, all or any part of which shall be available for use from time to time by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the purpose of increasing, with the approval of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, the capital of any Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation." (12 U. S. C. 1148a, 1940 ed., approved June 16, 1933, 48 Stat. 273.)

Sec. 1148b. Additional powers of Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations: "Each regional agricultural credit corporation, created under the authority of section 1148 of this title, in addition to the powers granted prior to August 19, 1937, shall have and, upon order and approval of the Farm Credit Administration, shall exercise the following rights, powers, and authority:

(a) Places of transacting business: "To conduct, transact, and operate its business in any State in the continental United States, in the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico."

(b) Borrow money: "To borrow money (other than by way of discount) from any other regional agricultural credit corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any Federal intermediate bank, and to give security therefor."

(c) Loans: "To lend any of its available funds to any other regional agricultural credit corporation at such rates of interest and upon such terms and conditions as may be approved by the Farm Credit Administration."

(d) Sale to or purchase from other like corporations: "To sell to or purchase from any other regional agricultural credit corporation or any other corporation formed by consolidation or merger as provided in section 1148c of this title, any part of or all the assets of any such corporation, upon such terms and conditions as may be approved by the Farm Credit Administration, including the assumption of the liabilities of any such corporation, in whole or in part." (12 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 1148b, approved August 19, 1937, 50 Stat. 710.)

Sec. 1148c. Consolidation or merger; power of Farm Credit Administration: "The Farm

Credit Administration shall have the power and authority to order and effect the consolidation and merger of two or more regional agricultural credit corporations, on such terms and conditions as it shall direct."

"The Farm Credit Administration is authorized to grant charters to, prescribe by-laws for, and fix the capital of, regional agricultural credit corporations which may be formed by the consolidation of two or more regional agricultural credit corporations, and to approve or prescribe such amendments to the charter and bylaws of any regional agricultural credit corporation as it may from time to time deem necessary. Corporations formed by the consolidation of two or more regional agricultural credit corporations, as herein provided, shall have all the rights, powers, authority, and exemptions; shall be subject to the same supervision and control; and shall have their expenses paid in the same manner as provided by law in respect to regional agricultural credit corporations organized under section 1148 of this title." (12 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 1148c, approved August 19, 1937, 50 Stat. 717.)

Sec. 1148d. Rights and powers unaffected by sections 1148b and 1148c. "Nothing contained in sections 1148b and 1148c of this title shall be construed as limiting the rights, powers, and authority granted prior to August 19, 1937, to the regional agricultural credit corporations, the Farm Credit Administration, or the Governor thereof by any acts of Congress or any Executive orders." (12 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 1148d, approved August 19, 1937, 50 Stat. 717.)

APPENDIX 5

Provision of law relating to operation of regional agricultural credit corporations contained in Reconstruction Finance Act and Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 (15 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 601 et seq.)

Sec. 602. Loans or advances to farmers: " * * * Provided, That \$50,000,000 of the amount so subscribed, and the expansion of same through the notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations, as set out in section 609 c of this title (as in force prior to July 21, 1932) shall be allocated and made available to the Secretary of Agriculture, which sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of making loans or advances to farmers in the several States of the United States in cases where he finds that an emergency exists as a result of which farmers are unable to obtain loans for crop production during the year 1932: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall give preference in making such loans or advances to farmers who suffered from crop failures in 1931. Such advances or loans shall be made upon such terms and conditions and subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe. A first lien on all crops growing, or to be planted and grown, shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be deemed sufficient security for such loan or advance. All such loans or advances shall be made through such agencies as the Secretary of Agriculture may designate, and in such amounts as such agencies, with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, may determine. Any person who shall knowingly make any material false representation for the purpose of obtaining an advance or loan, or in assisting in obtaining such advance or loan under this section, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not exceeding \$1,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or both. * * * " (15 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 602, approved January 22, 1932, 47 Stat. 5, 714, 728; 54 Stat. 572.)

APPENDIX 6.—Comparison of certain loan programs of U. S. Department of Agriculture

Agency	Loan purpose	Loan limits	Loan term	Rate of interest	Security
I. Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Program.	Advances for crop and feed production....	\$10 to \$400.....	1 year.....	Percent 4	Lien on crop and feed; unlimited personal liability.
II. Production Credit Association Loan Program.	Advances for crop and livestock production.	\$50 up.....	do.....	4.5	Lien on crop or livestock; unlimited personal liability.
III. Reorganized Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation Loan Program:					
(a) F-1 loans.....	Advances for crop production, harvesting, marketing; purchasing, raising, breeding, fattening, and marketing of live stock; production and marketing of poultry, poultry products, and dairy products; purchase and repair of farm equipment; cost of necessary labor and farm living expenses; existing obligations and accrued wages incurred in connection with current season's operations; payment of income taxes and taxes on real and personal farm property; payment of current interest on mortgage indebtedness and current instalments on any amortized farm mortgage loan; payment of delinquent interest, taxes, and other obligations may be financed.	\$1 to \$7,500..... \$1 to \$10,000..... \$1 to \$25,000 (livestock production).	do..... do..... do.....	5 5 5	Lien on crop; unlimited personal liability. Lien on dairy products; unlimited personal liability. Lien on livestock; unlimited personal liability.
(b) F-2 loans.....	Advances for financing actual current cash cost of producing and harvesting 18 designated "essential war crops" and delivering such crops for sale or for processing; cost of feed for work stock, seed, fertilizer, insecticides and spraying, labor, motor fuel and oil, repair of equipment, insurance on essential war crops; current expenses incidental to production of such crops. In case of crop failure the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation stands the whole or partial loss in cases not covered by insurance.	\$1 to \$7,500.....	do.....	5	Lien on crop, limited personal liability, crop insurance.
IV. Farm security rehabilitation loan program:					
(a) Standard type loan, accompanied by farm and home management plan.	Advances to purchase farm and home supplies, machinery, equipment, livestock, feed, seed, and fertilizer needed for a fresh start on a sounder basis; refinancing of indebtedness.	\$1 up.....	1 to 5 years.....	5	Mortgage on farm; lien on crops, seed, feed, fertilizer, equipment, etc.; unlimited personal liability.
(b) Nonstandard type loan, unaccompanied by farm and home management plan.	do.....	do.....	do.....	5	Do.
(c) "Food for freedom" loans:					
1. Loans to rural families on tracts of land too small for regular farm operation.	Advances to increase production of food for home use and for market.	do.....	do.....	5	Lien on crop; unlimited personal liability.
2. Loans to boys and girls of low income farm families for club projects.	Advances to increase food and fiber production for war needs.	do.....	do.....	5	Lien on crop, food and fiber.
(d) Grants.....	Subsistence.....	do.....	do.....		Grantee does specified work on farm or public lands.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

The VICE PRESIDENT subsequently appointed as members of the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, established by Senate Resolution 102, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

DEFERMENT FROM MILITARY SERVICE OF PERSONS ENGAGED IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is demanded, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 729) providing for the de-

ferment from military service of persons engaged in agricultural occupations.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Chair state the present parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I doubt if I can add anything to the debate which has taken place in connection with the bill now under consideration. Nevertheless, because I believe that the legislation is the byproduct—the end result—of a manpower muddle created by lack of proper executive administration, and because I believe the manpower muddle is symptomatic, I am sorry to say, of all or of a great portion of our entire war administration, I feel constrained for my own satisfaction to place a few of my observations and conclusions upon the record.

Mr. President, when this country declared war the President of the United States assumed vast powers inherent in his position as Commander in Chief of

the Armed Forces, and accruing under a great many statutory grants of power remaining upon the statute books as a residue from our participation in World War No. 1. Following the almost unanimous adoption of declarations of war, the Congress proceeded to grant vast additional legislative powers to the executive arm of the Government, and to appropriate unheard-of sums of money. At the time I did not object to those grants of power—nay; I participated in them, and added my vote in favor of them when the votes were taken because I believed, as I still believe, that in the waging of total war, if the manpower, the productive capacity, and the resources and fighting abilities of a democratic nation are to meet successfully the forces of nations governed by totalitarian power, it becomes essential for the legislative arm of the Government to yield temporarily much of its power.

I did take exception, as the record will show, to the granting of unlimited appropriations of funds in amounts over and beyond those which would be expended within the fiscal year, because as I said again and again in this Chamber, if the

Congress yielded the power over the purse strings, and appropriated more money than could be spent within the fiscal year, inevitably the Congress would at some time during the war find itself confronted with such a situation that its control over the purse strings had been so completely relaxed and relinquished that it could not even ask or demand a successful accounting as to the manner in which the vast grants of legislative power were being administered.

So, Mr. President, I am not criticizing the grants of power of a legislative nature. I recognized that necessity at the time when the powers were granted. I still recognize the necessity. However, I say that those vast grants of power should have resulted in the solution of some of the basic and major problems which must be decided by any nation once it enters upon war. I say that in the conduct of war, especially in the conduct of total war, no more important or fundamental problem can be involved than the problem of the efficient, equitable, and fair distribution of the Nation's manpower resources.

This is not the first time that I have been aware that a manpower crisis was developing in this country. I have frequently spoken of it in this Chamber and elsewhere during many months; but unfortunately, Mr. President, by its failure to deal with the manpower problem in an effective and efficient manner, the administration, despite all the vast powers within its possession, has permitted the manpower to be drained from the farms of the Nation. That drain upon manpower, as has been stated in this debate, has come primarily from two sources: On the one hand, it has come from industrial activity and higher wages; on the other hand, it has come from the exercise of the plenary power of selective service for military duty. I understand that approximately 70 percent of the drain on agricultural manpower has come from industry, and about 30 percent from the armed services, through the Selective Service System and through voluntary enlistments.

Mr. President, it has seemed to me that there has been in this debate some indication of criticism of men who have left the farms and have gone into industries in which they have been able to obtain higher wages, better working conditions, shorter hours, social-security benefits, and other inducements incident to labor in industrial plants. I say, that, on the contrary, if men had not left the farm and joined the labor industrial force of the Nation, we would not today be able properly to equip the troops which we are sending to fight and die on foreign soil and on the seven seas of the world. To have accomplished the astronomical objectives which were made necessary by our position as the arsenal of democracy and as a nation supplying its full quota of armed forces would have been utterly impossible with the labor force which was available to industry on December 1, 1941.

On the other hand, Mr. President, there was, it seems to me, an admin-

istrative and executive responsibility to influence temper and shape the manpower situation in such manner as would not result in a drainage of manpower off the farms of America to the point where it is now, in my opinion, threatening to produce in the year 1943 a serious, if not a critical and catastrophic, shortage of those things which we have come to accept as elemental and necessary to the American diet.

Mr. President, a part of this drain, as I have indicated, was due to the higher wages and better working conditions and the other social security benefits that flow from industrial employment. Having made a somewhat long study as a result of being chairman of a subcommittee of the Senate, of the conditions existing and surrounding labor employment in some of the farm areas, I say there can be no blame attached to the men and women who desired to escape from a condition bordering almost on peonage in order to obtain the higher pay scale offered by industry.

There has been a great deal of criticism, Mr. President, of the wages paid in industry. I may say that, no matter what may happen—and I choose my words when I make this statement—no matter what may happen, there cannot and there will not be in this country an equalization of the wage scale of industry down to the level of agricultural wages, taking them as a whole, in the United States; and any approach in that direction will prove utterly futile.

In my opinion, much could have been done to make employment on the farm more attractive than it is today; certainly much could have been done to remedy some of the conditions that exist in certain areas so far as the standard of living and wages of labor on the farm are concerned. But it has not been done; in fact, all efforts in that direction have met terrific resistance; and, therefore, we are confronted now, in the midst of this war, no longer by a theory but by a practical situation, which, I say, verges on the desperate.

The manpower problem on the farm, Mr. President, is only one phase of the crisis that exists on the food front. Manpower is an important and vital phase of the crisis that exists on the food front, but it is only a part of it. There is a shortage of farm machinery, which obviously has come at a time when there is a shortage in manpower and therefore a greater need for farm machinery and for multiplying, through the use of machinery, the labor that is still available upon the farm.

Furthermore, Mr. President, there are numerous difficulties and hurdles over which the farmer must jump in order to obtain some common articles which are necessary for the operation of the average farm.

Underneath the whole farm controversy is the fight which has been going on between those who contend for the utilization of large farms and those who desire to maintain the small farms. That was the issue upon which Mr. Parisius resigned from his position in the

Department of Agriculture. There is also a fight going on on the food front between those who believe that increased production should be stimulated by incentive payments from the Treasury and those who believe that the increase in farm production should be secured as the result of increased prices to the farmers themselves.

This struggle has resulted in internecine warfare in the Department of Agriculture itself, and I am sorry to say that that conflict has now broken out in the agricultural areas of the country, and various agencies of the Federal Government, or, at least, agencies that are supported in part by Federal funds, are now at each other's throats and are seeking to align the individual farmers behind one group or the other. It has involved the great farm organizations of the country in conflict which has been going on behind closed doors and in some instances has broken out into the open. This is happening at a time when the people of this country have every right to be concerned as to whether there will be sufficient foodstuffs grown in the United States to supply the armed forces, to meet our lend-lease commitments, and to furnish the necessary elements of a balanced diet to which the American public has been accustomed.

I contend, Mr. President, that this result as measured against the vast powers in the hands of the war administration of this Nation shows an utter lack of leadership and a confusion in organization which must be remedied if we are to win the war. It will produce a food shortage unless it is remedied and remedied at once.

In order that I may make it clear that what I am saying has nothing to do with personalities, I want to ask Senators to consider themselves for a moment in the shoes of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The control of the prices which the farmer is to receive for his commodities is balanced between the Administrator of the Price Administration, former Senator Brown; the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization.

The manpower problem is divided between the War Manpower Commission, the Department of Agriculture, and God knows who else.

The power over the manufacture of machinery for use on the farms, and other material needed to operate a farm, is in the hands of the War Production Board and the Department of Agriculture.

In other words, Mr. President, as I see it, there is an utter failure to establish vertical organizations upon which the Congress and the country could fix responsibility. Instead we have horizontal organizations, which overlap each other on the one hand, or afford gaps on the other.

This situation having been produced, Congress is now finally confronted with a belated effort, for we are already in the spring planting season, so far as areas in the South are concerned—we

are now confronted with a belated effort on the part of Congress to deal with the problem of manpower on the farms.

This brings me to say that, in my opinion, determination of the size of the armed forces is the No. 1 decision that has to be made before any equitable, efficient, or proper distribution of manpower can be made. If we are to raise the armed forces in 1943, as has been determined upon, to 11,000,000 or more, there will be a shortage of labor on the farms, and there will be a shortage of labor in industry.

Mr. President, I share every apprehension the opponents of the proposed legislation have uttered in the debate since its inception.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am greatly interested in the discussion of this matter by the Senator from Wisconsin. I ask him whether he intends to discuss the connection between the shortage of manpower and getting ore out of the ground; the shortage of manpower in the smelter to put the ore in condition to make a plowshare; the shortage of manpower in manufacturing the plowshare; the shortage of manpower in the forest to get the handles, and the shortage of manpower in the factory which manufactures handles for farm machinery and tools, in its bearing upon legislation which merely centers on the hired man on the farm?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I was not going into the detail the Senator has indicated but I tried to sum up the statement by saying that if we are to raise the number which has been agreed upon for the armed forces in 1943, there will not only be a shortage of labor on the farm, in my opinion, but there will be a shortage of labor in industry, and in speaking of industry, of course, I meant to include the raw material, or the natural resource, and the manufactured product.

Mr. President, as I stated a moment ago, I share all the apprehensions which have been expressed by the opponents of the proposed legislation. It is indeed a serious step to grant blanket deferments to any group in our population, and especially to grant them by legislative enactment. The moment we take that step, and seek to attain the same number of men for the armed forces, we are simply putting a heavier pressure upon some other occupational group or occupational groups within the population. The moment we grant occupational deferments to agriculture, we immediately increase the pressure and the force of the draft upon other occupations. I venture the prediction that within a short space of time there will be a demand from industry that the workers in industry be frozen, and that those who are essential be exempted from the draft.

The moment we take this step, we will produce a greater pressure upon the heads of families and those with dependents who are sought to be exempted

under the amendment now pending, offered by the able Senator from Montana. I do not want anyone to think that I am taking the step in connection with this proposed legislation which I intend to take without realizing some of the consequences which must flow in its train.

We are, as I fear, helping by this type of legislation to pave the way for the day when the able Senator from Vermont will be pressing the Senate to consider his measure for universal service for all citizens of the United States, civilians as well as those in the military service. According to my present lights, if that measure were pending today, I should be unalterably opposed to it. I think it would be the last gasp of democracy, when such a measure was passed. If the time comes when such legislation is put on the statute books in order to fight totalitarianism, we will have completely embraced it ourselves. But I cannot fail to register my apprehension that in moving in the direction in which we are now moving, we are helping to pave the way and to hasten the day when the Senator from Vermont will be able to say, "You have given deferment to this group, which has increased pressure on another group, therefore the time has come when we must have an orderly and an equitable distribution of the entire labor forces of the Nation."

I should not only be opposed to such a measure for ideological reasons, but I should be opposed to it, according to my present lights, because I think it seeks to treat this problem in a manner in which we have been all too prone to treat the problems arising from the war, when after maladministration, after failure to utilize all the facilities of leadership, and the great voluntary upsurge of spirit, energy, and activity which come with that type of treatment of a problem in this country, we have sought to cure the failure by creating some plenary, totalitarian power to cover it up.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I wish to say here and now that I think the late Justice Brandeis was completely right in his philosophy that there is a law of size. I do not know that law, I do not think any man knows the law in specific terms, but if there ever was any question about it—and I never had any—so far as the growth of the unit size of our industrial operations is concerned, certainly this war should have proven to any man that there is a law of size.

There are problems which go beyond the presently developed administrative skill of the human individual, and I think that when we seek to cover up the mistakes, the lack of administration, and the lack of utilization of voluntary methods, by the creation of totalitarian power, we only threaten to break down completely the administrative management of the war effort.

However, Mr. President, the hour is late so far as the 1943 season of agricultural production is concerned. I am convinced that under the Tydings amendment and the present disposition of those charged with the responsibility

for its management and articulation we cannot get a sufficient deferment of agricultural labor.

Food is essential. I am not an alarmist, at least I do not so regard myself, but I say that I have had greater apprehension as to the consequences which will flow from the failure to produce a reasonable amount of food and to have it distributed to the various centers of population in this Nation, than I have about any of the other complex and distressing problems which the war has forced upon us.

The word "food," Mr. President, touches the most elemental, fundamental instinct in the human being. We must maintain an adequate food supply in this country if the war is to be successfully prosecuted. I grant that the Johnson-Bankhead approach to this problem is a meat-ax approach. I know that we are going to freeze certain situations in the agricultural structure which never should be frozen. We are going to keep on the farms people who are not producing the amount of food which they should produce.

I come from a great agricultural State, about 50 percent of whose wealth in normal times is produced from agriculture and 50 percent from industry. I have the highest regard for the type of farm and the type of farmers we have in the State of Wisconsin, but I would not stand here on the floor of the Senate and contend that every farmer in Wisconsin is efficient, that every farmer in Wisconsin is energetic, that every farmer in Wisconsin is doing the best job he can do for the war effort by staying on the farm. But, Mr. President, the selective method on the basis of individual approach has broken down. It has failed so far as the farm front is concerned, and I am driven by the force of necessity to embrace this measure, much as I regard it as a dangerous step.

Mr. President, in conclusion I should like to say that I think the measure will fall short of the expectations which I fear have been created in the minds of the farmers. In my opinion it will not increase the labor supply on the farms. It will probably not increase the morale of some of those who are now working as wage workers on the farm. The tendency, I fear, will be to destroy morale of some of those who find themselves frozen in unconscionable conditions and at unspeakably low wages. But I shall support the measure, Mr. President, because I see no alternative which we can follow in time to avert a catastrophe on the food front in America in 1943.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for the enlightening argument he has made, and I wish to subscribe to the thoughts he has expressed. In his speech the Senator mentioned the shortage of food, and gave shortage of manpower as one of the big problems connected with it, and also the shortage of machines. I should

like to know if, before concluding, the Senator desires to make an observation with respect to the problem confronting Nebraska farmers as well as those of his own State, due to the limitation and restrictions of crops, such as wheat and corn, now enforced by the Secretary of Agriculture. Spring wheat has not as yet been planted. The Secretary of Agriculture the other day lifted the restrictions to the extent that there would be no penalty if a Nebraska or a Kansas farmer planted only up to 90 percent of the maximum wheat production. There is no penalty with respect to corn. In my county in Nebraska if a farmer overplants beyond 90 percent, then the benefit payments are not paid to him. He loses the benefit payment if he overplants.

It is my observation, and I have spoken of this on many platforms in the State of Nebraska, that one way to help overcome food shortages is to remove the limitations and restrictions during the war. The Senator from Wisconsin has been close to the Secretary of Agriculture and, during his several terms in the Senate, has had opportunity to discuss matters with him. I should like to know if the Senator from Wisconsin desires to make an observation with respect to whether it would be possible to encourage all-out agricultural production by removing the limitations and restrictions on the coming 1943 crop.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will say in answer to the Senator from Nebraska that I hope nothing I have said here has led him to believe that I am in any way speaking for the Secretary of Agriculture, or that I am intimately in touch with him. I am not. I do not have the good fortune even to be on committees before which he appears, so I am not in touch with him. But, as I understand, an effort has been made in the direction the Senator from Nebraska suggests by removing the limitation on corn, and in providing a 90-percent ceiling, so to speak, on wheat. I assume that was done on the basis of the available amounts in storage, the estimated increase in livestock production, and on the further theory that, in all probability, benefit payments would be paid in respect to the wheat farmer, and that perhaps it was desired not to cut off such benefits in view of the fact that the farmers at this time are complaining concerning their prices.

Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator very much. The Senator has not covered the subject as I should like to have him do.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator from Nebraska is asking me what my attitude has been in the past toward the program of restriction in agricultural commodities and products—

Mr. WHERRY. I refer to a removal of the restrictions during the war.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will say that I have supported that program, not because I thought it was an ideal program, but because there was no other tenable alternative presented.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin permit another question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. My question is directed to removal of restrictions during the war. Does the Senator wish to make an observation with respect to whether or not he favors the removal of limitations and restrictions for the duration of the war only, so that we may have an all-out maximum wheat production and corn production to relieve the food shortage? That is the point I wish to have stressed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Although I do not know what the answer would be, I presume the answer of the Department would be that they are seeking to stimulate the production of other commodities as well, and that therefore they feel that in order to obtain a balanced production they must retain some of the restrictions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to make one comment which is inspired by the address made by the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], and particularly his original approach to this question. I find myself totally perplexed by the responsibility which I confront here today to deal with just one sector of the manpower problem on a piecemeal basis and on a basis of inadequate information and without the opportunity to deal with it as a whole. The manpower crisis will never successfully respond to any such method.

Yesterday I spoke about responsibilities in connection with the war which unavoidably require primary legislative action. The Senator from Wisconsin puts his finger squarely on the source of our manpower difficulty, it seems to me, when he insists that the responsibility for the manpower problem is primarily administrative. Congress must accept its responsibilities. But administrative leadership must also wholly accept its responsibilities.

Mr. President, it seems to me that months and months and months ago the President of the United States should have called Admiral King and General Marshall and Director McNutt and Secretary Wickard and General Hershey and Mr. Nelson into one meeting at the White House, and put them in a room, and told them not to come out until they could agree how the available manpower of this country should be allocated. Then we should have had authentic advice respecting the manpower problem as a whole. Instead of that we now get what is described as a war cabinet to deal with the subject. The war cabinet includes such gentlemen as Judge Rosenman and Harry Hopkins, instead of the real experts.

Mr. President, I am in the same perplexity today that I am going to be a month from today, until the high administrative responsible head of this Government calls those immediately responsible to him for manpower together and presents the country and the Congress with a unified recommendation which conclusively covers all the necessities in all these indispensable directions—service needs, farm needs, industrial needs and civilian needs. The manpower crisis

is never going to be effectively met by piecemeal legislation on the floor of Congress.

Mr. WHEELER obtained the floor.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. DOWNEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gillette	Radcliffe
Austin	Guffey	Reed
Bailey	Gurney	Revercomb
Ball	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hayden	Robertson
Barkley	Hill	Scruggs
Bilbo	Holman	Shipstead
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Brooks	Kilgore	Taft
Buck	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Lodge	Tobey
Byrd	Lucas	Truman
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Mead	Walsh
Danaher	Millikin	Wheeler
Davis	Moore	Wherry
Downey	Murdock	White
Eastland	Nye	Wiley
Ellender	O'Daniel	Willis
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Wilson
George	Overton	
Gerry	Pepper	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have already sent to the desk an amendment providing as follows:

That section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(m) Every registrant who was married prior to December 8, 1941, who has maintained a bona fide family relationship with his family since that date, and who has a child or children under 18 years of age shall be exempt from training and service under this act."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] have pointed out the chaotic condition in which we find the manpower situation throughout the country. Ordinarily I would not offer an amendment providing for a blanket exemption of married men with children; but I ask Senators whether they believe it is necessary to induct every physically fit married man throughout the country between the ages of 18 and 38, regardless of the number of children he may have, and put him into combat service. If they believe it is necessary, I ask them, "What is to happen to the homes of America and to the future generations?"

I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin. I do not particularly like the amendment which is pending before the Senate, giving blanket deferment to farm labor. I shall vote for it only because of the chaotic condition in which we find ourselves. I believe that the

proposed legislation will not do very much good because men have already left the farms and have gone into industry, as I shall later show. I have offered the amendment because of the fact there is such a chaotic condition.

When the selective-service measure was first introduced into the Senate, did any Member of this body think for one second that married men with children would be taken into the armed forces of the country? When the proposal was introduced in the Congress, it was stated by the proponents of the measure that its purpose was to train the young men of the country for Army duties. It was for the purpose of training. It was a peace measure. Every piece of legislation which has come before the Congress of the United States was said to be peace legislation, and I said that almost every piece of such legislation was a step toward war.

Mr. President, we now find ourselves in a war, with the Selective Service Act upon the statute books. What does it do? Let me show how it works with reference to married men.

In my State, in North Dakota, Wisconsin, and in many other States, we find deferment for industrial purposes very large. Wisconsin has a deferment of 8.72 percent; Washington, 9.10 percent; Vermont, 6.82 percent; South Dakota, 9.16 percent; Nevada, 6.35 percent; Nebraska, 6.27 percent; Montana, 8.21 percent; Minnesota, 9.3 percent; and Kansas, 6.55 percent. Those States have the largest deferments.

A newspaper woman asked me today why those States have such large deferments. The question is easily answered. The reason is that when war industries were set up in Seattle, San Francisco, and all along the Pacific coast, thousands upon thousands of farm boys from North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Nebraska, and all the great western section of the country left their homes and went into the defense industries on the coast. As a result, they got deferments. They are out on the coast, but they are still registered in Wisconsin, or Montana, or Minnesota, or other States. Consequently, in those States when the draft quotas are obtained, it becomes necessary to take married men with families and also to take the remaining men left on the farms, because they are not deferred.

I have consulted with draft board after draft board in my own State. I have asked them why it was that they were taking boys off the farms. They said it was because they had to obtain their quotas, and the only way in which they could do so was by taking those boys. I asked them why last summer they took married men who were working on farms producing sugar beets and cattle. They said they did so because they had to fill their quotas, and that there was no other way to fill them.

So, instead of being a Selective Service Act, the act has worked out in such a way that married men with families are taken. They are taken in my State and in practically all other States. Why? Because the Selective Service Act has not been properly administered.

Let us consider what is done. Consider, for instance, the situation in two adjoining counties in Oregon, in Wisconsin, or in any other State. In some counties the married men are drafted. In other counties they are not drafted. Why does a difference exist? It exists because in some counties a sufficient number of single men are available, whereas in other counties the single men have left, to go into various factories, and so it has become necessary to draft the married men.

As the situation has developed, one might think that men were being drafted for 48 separate armies, not for one Army. In other words, if the State of New York has a shortage of single men, married men are taken. On the other hand, if New Jersey has available a considerable number of single men, married men or men with families are not taken. So there is a vast inconsistency in the way in which the law has been administered.

It is said that we should leave the matter up to the Administration. But we have done that. The trouble with Congress has been that, instead of writing into the law how the matter should be handled, we have turned the task over to the administrative authorities.

So far as I am concerned, what I am asking is that we cease turning powers over to the administrative authorities and that we have government of law, not of men.

Thomas Jefferson, the great founder of the Democratic Party, said that one should put his trust in no man, but should put his trust in the law.

The difference between a totalitarian government and a republic is that in a totalitarian government the people put their trust in one man. They become hero worshipers; they worship one man, whether it is a Hitler, in Germany, or a Mussolini in Italy, or a Stalin in Russia. They put their trust in Stalin; they put their trust in Hitler; they put their trust in Mussolini.

In the United States of America we have been drifting and drifting, day by day, week by week, and month by month, into totalitarianism, at a time when we say we are fighting for democracy all over the world.

So, today, I suggest that we no longer leave the working out of the problem to the Department. Let us say to them, "You have made a muddle of the whole thing; you have made a failure of the whole manpower program."

I do not know who is at fault. I do not blame Mr. McNutt. I say frankly that I do not know whether the fault is his or that of someone else. I do not know who is at fault.

Of course, the fault lies higher than Mr. McNutt. The failure is due to a lack of administrative ability at the head of the whole manpower set-up; because otherwise the failure could not possibly have occurred.

I agree with what the Senator said, that authority should be given to some one man if we are going to turn the power over to someone. We cannot turn it over to a dozen men or to half a dozen men and expect to have the power

equally divided among them. Someone must have the "say."

This morning I read a newspaper story that Governor McNutt and Mr. Nelson have finally agreed that we can take care of an army of 11,200,000 men or perhaps 13,000,000 men—whatever the number may be. Very few Members of the Senate knew that Governor McNutt and Mr. Nelson felt that it would not be possible to raise an army of that size and still have the industries and the farms of the country carry on.

However, now we know that they have been forced into line with the views of the Army. What does the Army know about the general situation? I do not have any fault to find with the Secretary of War; I think he has been a very able lawyer, and probably was a very able Secretary of State. Years ago he probably was a very able Secretary of War. I am not going to argue that matter. I ask any Member of the Senate, What does the Secretary of War know about the conditions existing in the Middle West? What does he know about the farm situation in the Middle West? He has been a Wall Street lawyer all his life, except for the time when he held office in Washington. I am not holding that against him. I simply am saying that his whole background is one which does not enable him to obtain a comprehensive view of what is going on today on the farms and in the industries in the West and Middle West.

Who is there in the Cabinet or connected with it who does know? Yet it is the Secretary of War and the group in his office who are saying that we must have an Army of 11,000,000 men.

When we passed the bill providing that 18-year-old children be taken into the Army, what were we told? We were told that they would be taken so that married men with children would not have to be taken.

It has been said that we should not have any blanket exemptions. Who gave the blanket exemptions? The President of the United States gave them to the men from 38 to 45 years of age. Congress did not do that. The President of the United States did it by Executive order. What reason was given? Because, it was said, men between the ages of 38 and 45 years could not stand up under the rigors of military training. We were told that a number of them had to go to hospitals. I think probably that is true.

But did it ever occur to any Member of the Senate that as a matter of fact the present war is different from the wars of the past? Today's war calls for mechanical warfare. Have all Members of the Senate realized that if we have an Army of 8,000,000 men in combat service we shall need at least 1,500,000 men, and probably more, in noncombat service? Why should we draft men between the ages of 38 and 45 years, men who could be used in noncombat service, and make them march 20 miles a day with packs on their backs, and break them down? Why do we not train them for noncombat service—to be guards around the Senate Office Building, to guard the bridges around the city,

or to do similar work? However, older men have been trained for combat service. Men between the ages of 38 and 45 years—single men or married men without children—could be used in noncombat service; and all the younger men—many of whom are now sitting around in the War Department, and many of whom are used as guards around buildings or in camps—could be relieved from noncombat duties and could be sent into combat service. If that were done, it would not be necessary to break up all the homes in America.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I wonder if the Senator can give me information on one phase of this great question. He has presented some figures as to the number of men who have been deferred in the respective commonwealths of the country because they are essential in industry.

First. I should like to know how many million men are in the group of single men who have been classified as essential in industry.

Second. I should like to know what steps have been taken by the Government to supplant the so-called essential men with women or with married men.

For instance, the figures show that in Russia 80 percent of the work formerly done by men now is being done by women; that in Britain, women have taken over, practically en masse, the farming industry, and other women have gone into the manufacturing industries in such numbers that factory after factory—and this point is borne out by the testimony of the President's wife—is run almost entirely by women.

Now, back to that question, how many million men, if the Senator has the figures, have gone from the farm or gone from the cities and are now classified as essential workers? I refer to men who are single and whose place could be taken by the married men or by the women as has happened in other countries.

Mr. WHEELER. I am sorry I cannot give the Senator the figures; I do not think the Government has furnished any figures on that subject; I have not seen them at all.

Mr. WILEY. Can the Senator inform us to what extent the Government is reaching out to try to get women who are single and married men over 38 to take these essential jobs?

Mr. WHEELER. My understanding is that the Government is not doing anything on that line at all.

Mr. President, on February 12, Major General Hershey, Director of the Selective Service, said most draftees within the next 2 or 3 months will be chosen from fathers "because there will be no one else left to induct."

On February 14 General Hershey and Manpower Director McNutt told the Nation that nearly all able-bodied men of military age would be in the service by the end of 1943, except a small minority in essential jobs.

A few days ago the testimony before one of the committees was to the effect that married men with children are going to be taken this summer.

Let me say, Mr. President, that I am not making this plea in behalf of the married men. Some one wrote me a letter and asked, "Have not the married men got as great a stake in this country as have the single men?" I said, "Yes, perhaps they have a greater stake in the country than have the single men." But, Mr. President, I am not appealing on behalf of the married men, not at all, what I am doing is appealing on behalf of the children of the United States of America.

Let me call attention to the fact that one of the differences between totalitarianism and a democratic form of government is that in a totalitarian country, such as Germany, or Russia, it is said that the men and the women and the children belong to the state. In America we say that the state belongs to the people of the country. When we take the steps which are being proposed, to induct married men into the service, it will become necessary to place their children in some kind of an institution; it will become necessary for the mothers to go to work in factories and leave their children to be taken care of by someone else. As the father of six children, I know that children cannot be raised in institutions as well as they can be in their homes, and children cannot be left in the care of institutions, whether in charge of W. P. A. women or any others, and be brought up to become as good citizens as if their mothers and fathers took care of them. The taking of married men would break up the home life of America, it would destroy the future generation, it would break down the morals of the American people. Mr. President, I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but I say—and I want those who listen to me to remember what I am saying here today—that when the fathers are taken away from their children there will be a moral let-down in the United States of America such as has never been witnessed in the history of this country.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate, as we all do, the earnestness and sincerity of the Senator from Montana in presenting and advocating this amendment. Nevertheless, the amendment does, it seems to me, complicate the bill now before the Senate. It is on a different line; it broadens the scope of the bill very considerably, and probably it is a matter that ought to be considered on its merits, as a whole, disconnected with this or any other bill. As the Senator knows, his proposal has not had committee consideration. That does not mean that a Senator may not offer an amendment simply because it has not been before a committee; I do not advocate any such position as that; but, in the case of a broad and comprehensive proposal such as this, it does seem that it would be better for a committee, some committee that has jurisdiction—and it would be the Military Affairs Committee in this instance—to obtain all the evidence possible as to the effect of it, and the fairness of it, as compared to other people and those already in the Army and Navy and other branches of the

service. I wondered, in view of that, whether the Senator would not feel himself justified in not pressing his amendment to this bill and withdrawing it. I earnestly hope the Senator may do that, because his amendment is so controversial that it might prolong the debate, and at the same time bring about such a complication of the legislation itself as to cause a doubt as to the final result. I appeal to the Senator from Montana to give the suggestion his earnest consideration.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I am in definite accord with the able majority leader in the request that the distinguished Senator from Montana withdraw his amendment and have it referred to a committee. It is a notable and worthy proposal and should be considered by a legislative committee. I, too, fear that it might imperil the final passage of the bill introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], which most of us—I think the majority of us—would like to see passed today. I merely join with the Senator from Kentucky in the request which he has made.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I do not want to jeopardize the pending legislation; I do not want to delay its passage. I realize that the amendment, broad as it is, should have consideration by the Military Affairs Committee, and that hearings should be held on it. Frankly, the reason I offered it was because of the fact that statements are constantly appearing in the press to the effect that married men with children will begin to be taken into the service in the next month or so.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. When the Senator concludes his immediate statement will he then yield to me?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. President, I feel keenly about this matter. I wish to call attention to the fact that I made a speech the other night—a short and hurried speech—over the radio on this subject. As the result of that speech, I received more than a thousand letters from women and organizations all over the country and from people in all walks of life. I have a few of them before me. I wish to call attention to an editorial from the El Paso Times. It is headed:

STOP DRAFT INJUSTICES

Senator WHEELER, of Montana, always has been distasteful to this newspaper—

The El Paso Times is not the only newspaper to which I have been distasteful.

Senator WHEELER, of Montana, always has been distasteful to this newspaper, but he was correct when he said in a radio address that the drafting of fathers should be prohibited "not for the purpose of saving the men, but saving the children."

As Mr. WHEELER contended, married men with children could fight more effectively

on the home front in producing the food and weapons of war for the United Nations.

This newspaper also is in complete accord with the Montana Senator's assertion that the greatest injustice done by inequalities of the selective service law is the system of drafting men on a local and State, rather than on a national basis.

Mr. WHEELER said every State should be required to exhaust its supply of single men before married men are called and that this procedure would have prevented the "inconsistency of some States already furnishing fathers to the Army while in other States single men still remain undrafted."

President Roosevelt, some time ago, apparently anticipated the criticism of the deferment of Government employees when he announced that a large number of them would be transferred to the fighting forces.

Nevertheless, Senator WHEELER advanced a powerful argument when he said:

"Washington alone could furnish a full Army division of men who are less essential to winning the war than the housewife who saves her kitchen fat. Their deferment evaded the spirit and intent of the draft law."

It is desirable that the War Department have a great deal to say about the formation and training of our fighting forces, but Congress would do well to straighten out inequalities in the selective service law.

Let me call attention to the fact that this newspaper has criticized me violently because of my position regarding the war. It has been one of the most strongly interventionist and pro-administration newspapers in the United States. Yet it expresses the feeling of the people of the United States with reference to the inequalities which exist.

Some think that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction and a growing bitterness in the country, and everyone on this floor knows that there is. We know that American morale is weakening, because of the things which have been going on, because of the bureaucracy and other things in Washington. It is weakening because the people see in Government bureaus all over the country young men who should be in the armed services. It is weakening because of the tremendous number of questionnaires being sent out; because of the tremendous waste and extravagance; because of the propaganda being sent out to the newspapers and to the radio stations, which the bureaus are overdoing; they are overplaying their hands. Everyone who knows anything about the psychology of the American people knows that over-propagandizing can be overdone, and that is what some officials in Washington seem to have forgotten entirely.

If my colleagues think for a moment that they have seen something, wait until the Government starts taking the American farmer away from the home, and leaving the wife and the children there, to be turned out into the street, perhaps, forcing the mother to go to work in a factory, leaving two or three or four or five or six children. I say that they will not only break down the morals of the country, but it will break down morale. If there is one thing the administration should know, it is that it is not possible to drive the American people too far. When they start taking men away from their children, and putting the children in institutions, as has been

done in Russia, and as has been done in Germany and Italy, I fear for what will happen to the United States. Perhaps I am overly pessimistic; I hope I am. But I think I am a realist about the matter, and I think I see what is going on, and know what is going to happen to the United States if the Congress does not call a halt.

We have turned the matter of manpower over to the Army and to the administration. They have failed in their manpower efforts, and now, because of the chaotic conditions which exist, because of the fact that they permitted some of the industries which have been on a 10-percent-plus basis to overplay and overstaff, we are brought to the condition in which we now find ourselves. I have received letters from men working on the Pacific coast, men who went from Montana, or who formerly lived in Montana, who have told me in their letters not to mention their names, stating that in the factories in which they are working people are falling over one another, or that they are falling over one another in some shipbuilding plant, that they are not doing anything. The more men there are on the pay rolls, the more money the owners receive from the United States in commissions. That is one of the reasons why there is this chaos in the manpower situation.

If that were not enough, go down to the War Department itself and observe the conditions. Do not go to some of the other agencies but go to the War Department itself. A young lady from my State whom I had never met came to my office and said that she was quitting her job there because she had been there for 6 months as a stenographer, having come from Missoula, Mont., and was resigning because she thought it was unpatriotic to draw a salary when she had not earned a 5-cent piece, for she had done no work. She said, "We are told that when anyone comes in to start pounding the typewriter in order to make it appear we are busy." Why is that? It is because if those in charge have 10 people working for them, they get one rate of pay, and if they have 20, they get more.

There is confusion and chaos in the War Department, which is overstaffed, and there are men walking around who should be in the combat service, with older men taking their places. There are physically fit young men in the State Department who are employed there because they speak some foreign language. One can see them around at teas. Could not the Department get some older men who speak a few foreign languages, and let the husky young fellows, single men, go into the armed forces and do a little combat service, instead of going around with their handkerchiefs up their sleeves? If some of them were met in eastern Montana, where the cowboys are, the cowboys would say, "I don't know whether to kiss them or kick them." [Laughter.]

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Unfortunately I have been unable to be present and hear

all the Senator has said with regard to the amendment which I understand he has offered with reference to the deferment of married men. I was wondering whether the Senator would not agree to withdraw his amendment and let it go to the Committee on Military Affairs. If the Senator will do that I assure him that we shall be delighted to welcome the Senator before the committee, to appear personally in regard to his amendment, or to bring any witnesses, and we will give him a hearing. I think that bringing the matter up now, and endeavoring to have it attached to the pending bill, is rather complicating matters. I hope the Senator will accept my suggestion.

There are many of us who are very greatly interested in what the Senator has to say, and there are many in this body, I dare say, who share the Senator's views with regard to the matter. I recognize that there are millions of people in this country who share the Senator's views. But the amendment the Senator has in mind is one of considerable importance, and I think it is one which should be given some study, too. I think it is a matter which should be considered generally and at length, perhaps, by the Committee on Military Affairs, which interests itself in the Selective Service Act.

I hope the Senator may find it possible to withdraw his motion, send the amendment to the Committee on Military Affairs, and let us consider it there. As I have said, we shall be glad to have the Senator come before the committee, and to hear any witnesses he may have to offer. If action should not be taken by the committee, the Senator would always have an opportunity of getting the amendment up, offering it as an amendment to some other bill. I hope the Senator will accept the suggestion.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Before the Senator from Montana states his position, inasmuch as the minority leader and the majority leader, for whom I have the highest respect, have been urging upon the Senator from Montana to withdraw his amendment so the consideration of the pending bill could be concluded tonight, I should like to suggest that I, too, have an amendment to offer, which provides, in effect, that in areas where there is a desperate shortage of transportation workers the same exemption may be applied to such workers as is applied in the bill to the farmer.

I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I have recently returned from the West, and that unless immediate action shall be taken, within the next 2 weeks, I fear it will not make any difference whether or not the farmers of the Pacific coast grow food products, because there will be no transportation for them.

I wish to say that every day for the last 90 days there has been a greater amount of freight piled up around the San Francisco Bay area which the trucks could not handle than there was the day before. There is freight in carloads,

which can not even reach the San Francisco ports, 75 and 100 miles away.

The conditions are so terrible—and I use that word not with any exaggeration—that the truck drivers are working 75 to 100 hours a week. The rate of accidents has increased 4 or 5 times. Valuable trucks and their equipment are being destroyed. Men are dying at the wheels, men are passing away on the jobs.

Mr. President, at the present time there is inability to move the essential war goods by the truck drivers who can be employed. The Government intends in the next year to send to the Oakland and San Francisco ports double or treble the amount of lend-lease goods that have been going there. It intends to increase tremendously the shipment of war materials to the aircraft and shipbuilding factories, and to place in San Francisco several hundred thousand more soldiers for training than are there now.

The trucking proprietors and the members of the trucking union have told me there is not the slightest possibility that the transportation systems of California can even handle the essential war goods, excluding farm crops.

Mr. President, I desire particularly to call to the attention of the senior Senator from Montana the fact that 80 percent of our farm crops are moved by trucks belonging to transportation companies, and not belonging to the farmers. The trucking companies of California have served notice upon our governmental agencies for weeks and months that the way things are going there will not be one truck available to move farm crops. I wish to say to the Senate of the United States that we are headed toward food riots and famine in fertile California. Even though we can by some miracle get the men on the farms to raise the food, we are not going to be able to transport it.

I have documented my statements made before the Military Affairs Committee with the written statements from the trucking companies and the railroads, and those statements clearly indicate to any man, unless he is blind and deaf, that we are headed toward the break-down of our economy in California.

Consequently I want to serve notice upon our distinguished leaders, that much as I respect their desire and wish and will, even though the senior Senator from Montana should not do so, I am going to endeavor to present to the Senate, and hope someone will listen to me, the desperate and terrible facts about conditions on the Pacific coast.

I may say, Mr. President, that yesterday or day before, while I was testifying in very vehement terms about the terrible conditions in California, the proprietor of an ambulance system came to see me, and heard my testimony. I knew I had been excited and indignant, and I said, "Did you think my statements were exaggerated?" He said, "Senator Downey, you did not tell half the truth."

One of the statements I had made was that Alameda, a small residential town

next to Oakland, formerly had 20,000 people and 20 doctors, but now has 10 doctors and 50,000 people. One doctor is required for every 1,500 population; otherwise our people cannot be properly taken care of. There in Alameda we now have 1 doctor for 5,000 people. The proprietor of the ambulance concern said to me, "There are terrible things now happening in the bay area. People are dying without medical care; people are dying because they cannot get into the hospitals." The night before he left there he was called to one man who had a burst appendix and who lay writhing for hours upon a bed of pain. Not one doctor could be gotten to attend him and no hospital space was open. That same night a woman lay for hours with a serious hemorrhage, and no doctor could be found to attend her and no hospital could provide for her.

There are literally hundreds of people in California who this week will die upon beds of pain because the doctors and the hospitals are not there available to take care of them. Hundreds of thousands of our workers are not getting enough to eat. Our entire civilian economy, Senators, is breaking down, and I am at least going to endeavor to tell the Senate and those living in the rarefied atmosphere of Washington what is happening, even though nothing will be done.

So I desire to serve notice that I have an amendment which I intend to press, consideration of which will certainly take the remainder of the day.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have a very great and fond affection for both the Democratic leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Republican leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I hesitate to press my amendment when both of them have asked me not to do so. I wish to finish some remarks, however, with reference to the amendment. I shall do that, and then, in compliance with the requests which have been made by the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Republican leader, and my good friend the Democratic leader, I shall not press my amendment to the bill. I wish to serve notice, however, that unless the Military Affairs Committee acts in the near future I shall offer my amendment as an amendment to some other proposed legislation which may soon be brought up.

The Senator from California [Mr. Downey] spoke of the lack of doctors in California. Recently a doctor in my State wrote to me offering his services. He happens to be a man about 60 years of age, but a very competent surgeon. I took the matter up with various departments but could find no place where he could be used in the war effort.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to an article published in the Washington Post on March 7 of this year. This is another newspaper which, like the El Paso Times, could very well say that I am distasteful to it. I certainly am to some of its columnists. The article is by Marshall Andrews, and is headed:

LIMITED SERVICE TASKS SUGGESTED FOR MEN 38-45 WITHOUT DEPENDENTS

I read from the article, as follows:

Mechanization of warfare has one peculiar and paradoxical effect in that it has made vastly more important than ever before the factor of men.

Warfare never was a simple matter of counting noses and taking into the field a greater number of men than the enemy could muster. If that had ever been true, the nation with the largest male population would have been invincible without ever having to fight a war. Rather have wars been won or lost, aside from moral factors, by the ability of nations to supply and feed their armies after the armies themselves have been raised.

Mr. President, a few days ago I called attention to one of the longest editorials that has ever appeared in the New York Times, dealing with this very subject, and pointing out that as a matter of fact it is entirely possible that a 5,000,000-man army might be far more efficient and better than a 10,000,000- or 12,000,000-man army. I continue to read:

Today's armies require an infinitely greater amount of supplies than armies have ever required before in history. They travel in motor vehicles and fight in motor vehicles protected by armor. Their weapons consume limitless quantities of ammunition and their motor vehicles limitless amounts of fuel.

They fight across distances of water which no general in his right mind would have dared try to surmount a few hundred years ago.

All these things, these motor vehicles and these automatic weapons with their vast appetite for ammunition, and the great water-borne supply lines which must be maintained in the face of enemy opposition, have made industry fully as important in warfare today as armies themselves. And the people who work in these industries as well as the soldiers who fight in the armies must be fed and clothed and transported.

That is why manpower and the proper disposition and use of manpower has become a problem which threatens to disrupt the front behind the front unless something intelligent and forthright is done and done soon to meet it.

At present it appears that young men with families must be drafted unless Congress decides otherwise. And, unfortunately, Congress has provided nobody to take the places of these young married men should their induction be forbidden by law.

We have not taken any such step, because we have left it to the administration. When the administration says it is not going to take men from 38 to 45 and put them in the noncombat service, then, of course, the probability is that married men with children will be taken.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

LIMITED-SERVICE TASKS SUGGESTED FOR MEN 38-45 WITHOUT DEPENDENTS

(By Marshall Andrews)

Mechanization of warfare has had one peculiar and paradoxical effect in that it has made vastly more important than ever before the factor of men.

Warfare never was a simple matter of counting noses and taking into the field a

greater number of men than the enemy could muster. If that had ever been true, the nation with the largest male population would have been invincible without ever having to fight a war. Rather have wars been won or lost, aside from moral factors, by the ability of nations to supply and feed their armies after the armies themselves have been raised.

Today's armies require an infinitely greater amount of supplies than armies have ever required before in history. They travel in motor vehicles and fight in motor vehicles protected by armor. Their weapons consume limitless quantities of ammunition and their motor vehicles limitless amounts of fuel.

They fight across distances of water which no general in his right mind would have dared try to surmount a few hundred years ago.

DISPOSITION IMPORTANT

All these things, these motor vehicles and these automatic weapons with their vast appetite for ammunition, and the great water-borne supply lines which must be maintained in the face of enemy opposition, have made industry fully as important in warfare today as armies themselves. And the people who work in these industries as well as the soldiers who fight in the armies must be fed and clothed and transported.

That is why manpower and the proper disposition and use of manpower has become a problem which threatens to disrupt the front behind the front unless something intelligent and forthright is done and done soon to meet it.

It is too late to apply the obvious remedy of determining the job for which each man is best fitted and placing him in that job. The armed forces already have taken 6,000,000 or so men out of industry and industry already has taken hundreds of thousands from the farms. To juggle the situation now so all these people could be fitted back in their proper places again is obviously impossible.

ASPECTS CONFUSING

It is difficult for the man in the street to see the manpower question in all its aspects.

He is assailed constantly by the claims of too many interested factions, of politicians angling for votes, of union leaders bidding for power, of farmers determined to take advantage of their first opportunity for profit in a generation, of the Army and the Navy with a war to win and needing plenty of able-bodied men to win it.

Women have taken the places of men in large numbers in industry and have done so efficiently and well. Proposals have been made in Congress to change the Selective Service Act in one way or another, chiefly so as to make the greatest numbers of voters happy. Farmers have sold their herds and left their land, for lack of hands to produce crops, and have followed their hands into industry. Yet the manpower problem remains where it was and what it was and a great deal of talk and writing has done nothing to alleviate it.

ONE SOLUTION

While admitting that the civilian agencies having to do with manpower and its use have done little so far beyond muddying the water, the Army and Navy appear to have at hand one simple measure which should aid the situation if they would only apply it.

Shortly after the draft age was lowered to include youths of 18 and 19, the Army stopped inducting men over 37. Then all control of selective service was placed in the hands of the War Manpower Commission, headed by Paul V. McNutt, and induction of men above 37 for all the armed forces was halted. That was done because these men of what the Army

called advanced age were found unable to bear the rigors of training.

It was discovered, in fact, that less than 3 percent of them could even pass the physical examinations for admission to the service.

This action appears based upon the assumption that every man who wears a uniform is destined for combat service. That is not true.

There are hundreds of thousands of men, most of them able-bodied and fit for service on any front, now enrolled in service units and zone of the interior military police battalions and inland antiaircraft regiments. These men will never see actual fighting, except in the most extreme circumstances.

MILLION MEN AVAILABLE

On the other hand, there are approximately 8,000,000 men, 38 to 45 inclusive, who have not been called for service and, under present rules, never will be. Of these 8,000,000, some 3,000,000 are without dependents.

If two-thirds of these men without dependents are not engaged in essential occupations, which certainly should be the determining test in whether to draft single men, then a million men are available for service who are not being used. These men, or as many of them as can pass limited physical tests, could be drafted for limited service.

In that capacity they would release for fighting the thousands of able-bodied youngsters who now are pounding typewriters and issuing clothes and cooking and doing all the sundry other household chores for service installations here at home. They could take over the duties of guarding the White House and the Capitol and the reservoirs of cities and important bridges and the like and let young men in military police battalions and infantry regiments go to the front. They could replace able-bodied young men in the antiaircraft batteries set up in American cities against the remote chance that an enemy airplane or two might reach the continental United States.

WOMEN USED IN ENGLAND

Women are used in large measure to man these batteries in England, where they have been fighting enemy aircraft for 3 years.

The Navy to a great extent and the Army to a lesser degree have replaced men in office jobs with women. After the first heady burst of romance died, efficient office girls have not been in any too great hurry to exchange jobs at good wages for enlisted pay and military discipline, but beyond this is the fact there are many military jobs at home for which women are not well fitted.

These jobs include military police and guard duty, which can be performed as well by men over 38 as by the fit young soldiers who now fill them.

GAP MUST BE FILLED

The men who would be released for active service by such a draft of older men would fill a gap which must be filled in one way or another. At present it appears that young men with families must be drafted unless Congress decides otherwise. And, unfortunately, Congress has provided nobody to take the places of these young married men should their induction be forbidden by law.

A valuable byproduct of drafting older men for limited service undoubtedly would be that a great many of these men would rush to take their places in essential industry or on the farms to make themselves no longer liable to call. Thus the manpower situation as a whole, as well as that of the services, would be in some measure alleviated. Obviously the manpower muddle is not going to be cleared by arbitrary legislation which does not take into consideration all the many and conflicting factors which

contribute to making it a muddle. Nor is it helped by confusing and contradictory ukases from Manpower Commission headquarters.

The time to apply the obvious panacea has passed. Yet it does appear that one huge reservoir of men has not been tapped, men possibly unfit for fighting, but who can release hundreds of thousands of men who are fit to fight.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to some letters I have received. One is from St. Louis, Mo., and I read from it:

My DEAR SENATOR: It is after much deliberation that I write this letter to you at a time so busy as this, but I feel that I represent the feelings of thousands of other mothers in so doing. * * * I believe every mother who is faced with the great responsibility of molding character and citizenship into our future Americans, upon whose shoulders the bulk of repair will fall, agrees in backing you all the way.

It is so much deeper than purely financial, when the head of the family is taken away, although that alone is a serious problem too. Records bear me out in the fact that juvenile delinquency is rampant in divided homes; the Nazis have a fashion for increase in population, but the destruction of the standards of real home life is showing its effects now, and they are being reminded too late that the home is still the backbone of the nation.

Everyone who has had anything to do with civic affairs knows that what this lady says is true—that juvenile delinquencies are rampant when families are broken up.

That is what we are about to do in this country. We are about to break up the home for the purpose of saving homes in America. We are about to break up the homes and take the fathers away from their children in order to bring about the "four freedoms" over in China and in Russia. Freedom from fear. What are we doing? We are instilling fear into the mind and heart of every man, woman, and child in the United States, particularly the children of the country, when we take the fathers away from them.

I continue reading from the letter:

If our population is to continue to increase, and still remain of the highest type possible, we need to concentrate on the sound, solid families who form the front line of defense at home. It is my conviction that any of these families will save more, work much harder, and really sacrifice time, money, and if the time should come that it were necessary, even give their lives willingly for home and country all the more so when their family is welded solidly together.

After all, are there any of us who now do not have brothers or sons, or other loved ones in the armed forces? Would we dare not to back them with every ounce of strength, every waking minute of very long days, and with our prayers, and with every sacrifice within our power? Everyone cannot go into combat, but everyone can be a real soldier at the battle front or home front, and who can do more good at the home front than real fathers, who have found the genuine thing in life worth fighting for, posterity and its freedom? Who of them could be a slacker?

This is the first letter I have ever written to a statesman, and the things I have not written so well, nor are they new to you, but they express the gratitude in my heart to you for what you are doing, to help end this

war victorious, and at the same time help us mothers to rear the finest Christian Americans the world has ever seen, and I pray that each of us may do our very best in backing our brothers and sons who are giving their all, so that we may live to give the new generation the opportunity to be the greatest ever.

Sincerely,

MAURINE C. DENMAN.

I now invite attention to a letter from Oakland, Calif.:

FEBRUARY 26, 1943.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: Our wholehearted support on your new bill which will defer from the draft fathers married prior to December 7 until all other single and married men are taken. We, the undersigned, were married prior to December 7 and also prior to the original draft bill back in 1940.

It does not seem fair to our children, because God willed that they be born in these unhappy times, that they should go through life branded as "illegitimates."

Being connected with our Oakland Board of Education for several years before my marriage I know that 93 percent of our problem children come from broken homes. What is to become of our babies if your bill is not passed? Are they to become the problems of the future as we must face the fact that all of our husbands will not come back? If you yourself are a father, you know that to send the fathers of our children off to kill and destroy would be to kill and destroy the future of the coming generation. How can a child be properly guided through life without the backbone of the family, a father?

We are pulling for you and your bill, heart and soul.

That letter is signed by a number of ladies in California.

I quote from a letter which comes from New York:

May I add my voice to your movement to amend the Selective Service Act to provide for the drafting of all single men up to age 45? The disrupting of families by the taking of fathers, when there are available healthy bachelors, is an outrage and against the best interests of the home, that last fortress of a democracy.

Here is one from Omaha, Nebr.:

I read in the last evening's World-Herald of this city that you are drawing up a bill which included taking all able-bodied Army men from desk jobs. I think this is the most commendable bill I know of. I have long been noticing this situation. At first I definitely thought that this was a job for the military to decide alone, but now I feel it is high time for Congress to take a hand.

Here in Omaha last week a major received his promotion to lieutenant colonel. He is a West Point man. His job: In charge of permanent archives being established here for Civilian Conservation Corps records under the Washington Adjutant General's office. At this critical time a building was taken over, vital shipping space being used, and a force of at least 200 is being used at this time to strip (throw out many of the files that were shipped) and to consolidate these files. Since these records must have been available at the various service commands, I feel the project of consolidation would have been a very good one for after the war.

I give you my name and address in confidence.

Many of these letters which come to me say, "Don't use my name." The writers are afraid. Men and women of America are afraid to write to a United States Senator, afraid that the fact that they write a letter to their Senator or

Representative may be used against them, or that they may be checked up by the F. B. I., or someone else. We talk about freedom of speech in America. We talk about one of the "four freedoms"—freedom from fear. Yet, as I have already said, we are attempting to instill fear into the hearts of the American people.

Here is a letter from New Orleans. I quote a paragraph:

It is a sad situation in life when children do not have a father for their guidance. The mother, then, has to go out and earn a living, leaving her small children to shift for themselves, the best way they can, while she is away at work. This has a tendency to destroy the American home.

Please do all you can to help defer the fathers of American children. Thanking you for any consideration whatsoever, I am—

I now quote from a letter received from Kansas City:

But have you considered, sir, how very strongly such a bill would affect those of our boys, married and single, who are now fighting on foreign fronts, or those stationed at present within our country or its territories?

We must realize that the drafting of fathers will shatter the dreams that sustain these boys wherever they are. They are fighting for America, and to them America is American homes. It is what they left behind, what they hope to come back to. They feel that theirs is the lot to fight for and protect the principles which they cherish. They leave to their brothers at home the duty to sustain these precious principles.

Every single American boy who goes away is looking to the day when he can have a home. Yet, Mr. President, we are taking married men and putting them into service. Where is the mind of a married man when he is sent to Australia, or to a camp for a couple of years in Florida, Texas, or some other place? What is uppermost in his mind? He is wondering who is taking care of his children, and how his wife is getting along. He is wondering whether they are having the proper care.

We talk about men 38 years of age and over not making the best soldiers. I questioned General McNarney before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with reference to the question of whether or not married men with children made good soldiers. His reply, of course, was that they were not as good soldiers as unmarried men.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BONE. There is one aspect of this problem which has interested me very much, and that is the allowance made for the wife and children—if there be children—who remain at home. For the purpose of the RECORD, will the Senator indicate what allowance is made by the Government to the dependent wife and children of a soldier when the husband is taken into the Army?

Mr. WHEELER. I believe other Senators can answer that question better than I can. I did have the facts, but I do not now recall them.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The wife is allowed \$28; and an additional \$22 must be allotted by the soldier. So she receives \$50 a month plus \$10 or \$12 for each child.

Mr. BONE. I am wondering if any effort has been made to examine that particular aspect of the problem with the view of making a much more generous allowance for the family. It might eliminate some of the hardships. Obviously, no woman can maintain a home on \$50 a month. It is utterly impossible.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator from Washington. I believe that a re-examination should be made of the whole subject of allowances to dependents of soldiers and that a better system can be devised, now that we have had some experience in that field.

Mr. BONE. It seems to me that if there is to be any effort made to maintain standards of common decency in American homes where the father has been drafted—assuming it to be proper to continue to draft married men—some decent provision should be made for the support of the family.

If that field were thoroughly explored, and Congress made some reasonable provision for the wife and children at home so they could maintain some sort of a decent standard of living, it might eliminate some of the objections which the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] has registered against drafting married men. I do not know whether the Senator has emphasized the inability of the wife at home to maintain decent standards, but it is a stark tragedy for many. Fifty dollars a month is not a decent standard unless the wife is able to work.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly.

Mr. BONE. And if she has little children she cannot work.

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad to have the Senator call my attention to that point. Take a woman receiving \$50 a month, with the cost of living constantly going up. How can she properly provide for herself and her children unless she has parents who can support her? She must go to work. She must put her children in some kind of an institution during the day, or hire somebody to take care of them. We all know that today servants are hard to secure.

Mr. BONE. Of course, if we are going to create an army of the size we contemplate, counting the civilian members of our fighting forces we probably shall have 15,000,000 in our armed forces. In order to obtain a force of that size, it would seem that it would be necessary to draft married men. But if we are going to draft married men, I think we must consider the problem of supporting their families, and Congress would have to be more generous. Supporting their families would be a part of the cost of fighting the war, and there is no escaping the cost. If we are going to take married men with families, we must be prepared to pay the necessary and vital expenses incident to using such men in the armed forces. One of those expenses is that involved in the maintenance of the families at home.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say to the distinguished senior Senator from Washington that it is now admitted that we cannot even approximate our war program unless we utilize the services of and take from the homes of America most of the married women with children—women who are of an employable status. There will be no sympathy with the suggestion of the Senator from Washington; because it will be the desire of the Government to leave the women with children in such financial condition that they will have to work.

Mr. President, in California we have exhausted every reservoir of labor except that constituted by mothers with children at home. Now we are starting on the last desperate drive to establish nurseries. So there will be no sympathy with the Senator's suggestion that the woman whose husband is taken from her, and who is left with children, will have to be given enough to live on.

Mr. BONE. It is unfortunate that what has been said by the Senator from California probably is true. It is a great tragedy. I know how he feels about the situation. But every authoritative statement I have seen indicates that 8 or 10 people working at home, turning out civilian goods and war goods, will be required in order to maintain our Army in the field and to produce the ships, tanks, and other things vitally needed in the war effort.

If that be true, of course women will be utilized in that effort. But a very peculiar emotional condition will arise in the country when men find their wives and children up against that sort of situation. We might as well face that fact. I do not know of any other answer than to give the women who have children at home enough money to live on.

Mr. President, this war will not be a cheap war. We might as well abandon that idea now, if we cherish it. It will be a very expensive war. It is an all-out war, and will require the expenditure of vast sums of money. The sooner Congress abandons the idea that it is going to be thrifty in some respects—particularly as to the ones I have mentioned—the sooner we shall make progress along the line of taking care of the situation at home.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me read a letter I have received from Stamford, Conn.

STAMFORD, CONN., March 11, 1943.

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER,
Senator from Montana,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I was encouraged to read in the papers recently that you were making a determined effort to postpone the drafting of married men with children.

Although I am only 30 years old, I am responsible for a wife, two pre-Pearl Harbor children, and within a few months another child. I do not intend to argue against those who are in a position to know what the size of the Army should be. However, I am very worried about the support of my family, if and when I am drafted. Surely the Gov-

ernment cannot expect a woman taking care of two children, and probably three, to earn a living working in a factory and, as you know, the allowance which the Government will grant a family does not even pay the rent which I am sure the landlord will try to collect every month. Of course, these facts are all known to you; however, it seems to me that when fathers are drafted the ones with one child and then two, and so on, should go first. I also wonder how much fight the Army expects to get out of a guy worried how his wife and children are going to eat from one day to the other, particularly when millions of soldiers are still in the country. I traveled and lived in Europe prior to 1932 and I came to the conclusion that the chaotic situation in Germany which brought about Hitler's rise to power, to a certain extent can be attributed to the lack of a home and family unit as a whole. Hitler broke up the home first and brought about dissension among its various members, and we are now proceeding to do the same thing. I shudder at the thought of small children being brought up without a father as well as the bare necessities of life, about which we read and talked so much. Post-war security is all very well, but, what about security now for those who are the backbone of the Nation?

I can only hope that you and others who think alike will be successful in your efforts.

Respectfully yours,

L. H. TRUEBNER.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say that California is now far along the road leading to the demoralization and chaos in which the whole Nation will find itself plunged in 90 days. For several months we have had tens of thousands of married women with children working in our defense factories. The workers in California—take, for instance, those in the aircraft industry—have been castigated because of the large percentage of those who have quit their jobs. If we eliminate from consideration the separations from work caused by military demands, we find that the overwhelming proportion of persons quitting their jobs in aircraft factories have been women. Why have they been quitting? Those who have been quitting have been married women with one, two, three, or four children—women who have been keeping house for their husbands, women who have been working 15 or 16 hours a day, until their health and energy have broken down, and they have had to give up their jobs.

Mr. President, the individual tragedies among children left at home, left alone—left locked up in a garage or in an automobile, left to the care of some neighbor, or even left all alone—are almost infinite in number in California. We are so heavily burdened that we are going to create nurseries. However, we do not have the necessary transportation, food, housing, or workers. So, Mr. President, I say that if other Senators would go to California now they would see there an example of the demoralized and decayed economy which I predict will be found everywhere else in the United States within the next 90 days or 6 months.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I read now from a letter which I have received from A. Q. Miller,

publisher of the Belleville Telescope, Belleville, Kans.:

THE BELLEVILLE TELESCOPE,

BELLEVILLE, KANS., March 6, 1943.

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER, M. C.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your statement regarding draft of married men with children—breaking up the American home—until the manpower problem is more fully explained to the average citizen is sound.

So far as I know the big-army fellows have not yet explained the need of a 10,000,000 man Army—especially if it is going to dislocate our domestic economy and cripple our food production, as is apparent.

Why don't we go to the source of the manpower problem—the draft—and deal with the problem instead of treating the symptoms? The whole question goes back to the size of the Army. Senator BANKHEAD, I believe, made a statement the other day that by the end of 1943 we would probably have on foreign soil about 2,600,000 men, and at that time there would be more than 5,000,000 still in training in this country (out of the war and out of productive enterprise).

* * * The big war fellows will never take a sane and realistic view of the domestic side of the picture—that will have to be done by the Congress, and that is what the people are expecting the Congress to do, protect the home front as well as the war front by a balanced manpower.

Be assured, the country is back of you in your courageous fight to keep the manpower in balance, so as not to dislocate and hamper the war effort, and at the same time preserve the constitutional rights of the Congress.

Yours sincerely,

A. Q. MILLER,
Salina, Kans.

Let me say, Mr. President, that all the letters I have received and have read have come from people, all of whom want to have the United States win the war, and want to do everything they can to help our country win the war, but who feel that when we draft millions of married men with dependent children, instead of helping win the war, we hurt the war effort more than it would be hurt by anything else which could possibly be done.

I read now a letter which I have received from a resident of East Berlin, Pa.:

EAST BERLIN, PA., March 8, 1943.

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: * * * I would like you to know how much I appreciate the fact that you intend to sponsor legislation which would go a long way toward maintaining the standards of the American home.

I am convinced that no nation can ever rise above the level of its homes, and I believe that the integrity and stability of the home would be definitely endangered if fathers were to be called into the service before all other means of obtaining manpower have been exhausted, in other words before all available men without children have been taken.

I am convinced, too, that Congress, rather than some governmental agency, should be entrusted with determining the proper ratio which should exist between the size of the Army and the civilians necessary to properly support this Army, and that Congress alone should determine the procedure to be followed in raising this Army.

I certainly hope that your legislation, or similar legislation such as Congressman KILDAY is sponsoring, will soon be acted upon

favorably, thus placing authority over this vital matter where it belongs.

Your devotion to your country, and ours, has inspired well-thinking Americans for years and I wish you continued success in all your efforts.

Yours very truly,

JOHN H. MYERS.

Mr. President, one Member of the Senate suggested to me today that possibly the amendment should not go as far as it does, that possibly we should entirely eliminate the taking of married men with families, or at least should exempt them until January 1 or February 1, 1944. I should have no objection to an amendment to that effect; but I say that before we start taking married men with families we should examine the problem more carefully than it has thus far been examined. We should examine the question of how many single men between the ages of 38 and 45 years we can obtain for noncombat service. As a matter of fact, a great many men over 45 years of age could be used for noncombat service. We even could use Senators who are 60 years of age for such service. Men of those ages could do a great deal of the noncombat service. Men 60 years of age could serve as watchmen around the Capitol, and as guards at bridges and at various other places throughout the country.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. Does the Senator think that, by any possibility, some of the keymen in the departments, men designated as keymen—colonels and such—could be spared?

Mr. WHEELER. I think there is no question that they could be spared. As I said a while ago, if we go down to the War Department we find that it presents one of the worst examples of wasted manpower in the country. We find that to be the situation in the War Department itself.

Mr. President, I have here a letter from North Dakota along the lines suggested by the Senator from Oregon. The letter is marked "Personal," and the writer says:

Being in civil service since November 1, 1940, and listed as Administrative Assistant, State headquarters, Selective Service, I would like to remain in the Government service, so I know you will, Senator, not bring my name into the picture.

He states in the letter:

One thing you are questioning which I believe will bring forth some injustices and cover-ups is the number of officers assigned to noncombat duty.

The very thing about which the Senator was speaking.

Take Selective Service as an illustration—an officer detailed to Selective Service cannot, I understand, be transferred out. One illustration of this is an officer who was formerly here—Major Roquette who was transferred to Wyoming State headquarters but doesn't like it and wants to be transferred to active duty with troops—but cannot as he is permanently detailed to Selective Service.

The regulations of Selective Service you will note are so written that practically no one except a commissioned officer can be on a State headquarters staff, and where there were any in any of the States who were not

I believe they have all been or are in the process of being eliminated. Here in North Dakota there are 7 commissioned officers on the State headquarters staff; their pay and compensation amounts to approximately \$40,000 per month, some \$5,000 a month more than received by all of the other 18 employees in addition to 2 enlisted men who are detailed here.

The same policy is followed here as is now being started in the Manpower Commission; all of these officers are "experts." All of the officers here are within the combat age for duty with troops, but as above stated, they are permanently detailed to Selective Service and cannot be transferred. Notwithstanding the fact that there has always been in my opinion too many officers here, a new one was recently transferred in and since has been promoted to captain.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Austin in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It seems reasonable to me that they should take some of the older men, men over 45, and put them in uniform to do administrative work all over this city. All over the United States, where there are defense plants, there are young men in uniform doing work as inspectors and accountants, and it seems to me that if women can be called upon to do farm work, women could perform clerical work in the departments or could work as messengers, and we could get older men to work as accountants, and to do other work the young men strutting around in uniform are called upon to do. It is not military work at all.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree with the Senator. Do Senators recall how many of these boys in the departments were shouting for war? They were shouting for war, shouting for the administration's foreign policy, and for war. They were great patriots. They wanted to fight—until war was declared. Then they sought refuge in the departments in some soft jobs, and are there yet. Ginsburg is a good example of it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree entirely with what the Senator has said about the overcrowding of the departments, and in fact the departments are filled with useless employees. My father once said, in peacetime—and of course it is very much more applicable in wartime—that the Government would be very much better operated if half the employees were discharged and the other half were made to go to work.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is true.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I must say that so far as many of the departments are concerned, I have been told by a number of responsible officials, including those of some of the temporary agencies as well as some of the regular establishments, that they are not responsible for the overcrowding, that the Civil Service Commission, since it got a ukase from the President, puts people into the civil service, has indeed, been roaming around the country begging people to come to Washington and accept employment in the Government service. I know of cases

of my own knowledge on all fours with those the Senator from Montana told us about a while ago, of people who have been here for 6 or 8 months without ever finding out what they were supposed to do in the department where they were employed. I believe that the departments are not entirely responsible for the condition, that the Civil Service Commission should be curbed in its activities in roaming around the country recruiting people, and taking men out of the draft.

I should add that when some man subject to the draft writes to his local draft board, in Montana, Missouri, California, North Carolina, South Carolina, or any other State, after registering and tells them he should be exempted because he is employed by the Treasury Department, or employed by the War Department, or employed by some other Government organization, it is perfectly natural for the local draft board to think he is doing essential war work, and to defer him. In that connection I should like to point out that the local draft board, at the point of a man's residence, always retains jurisdiction and control of him, and, according to my information, the condition I have recounted has resulted in thousands of men who were perfectly liable for military service being deferred, on the theory that they were engaged in essential war work, when in reality they were not.

In the city of St. Louis we have what is known as the council of draft boards, an absolutely voluntary organization, an association organized by the draft boards themselves for the purpose of exchanging experiences, and trying to bring about uniformity. Col. John J. Griffin, the head of the council of draft boards of St. Louis, tells me that there are thousands of men, nonresidents of St. Louis, who have been deferred by their local draft boards, in Arkansas or Mississippi, in rural Missouri or rural Illinois, who have come to St. Louis and claimed deferment from their local draft boards at Lone Ridge, Ark., or Pine Bluff, Ark., or Poplar Bluff, Mo., or some other place, because they happen to be employed by the Curtiss-Wright Co., or some other company which may be engaged in munitions work.

They are deferred by the local draft boards on that ground, when, if the St. Louis board had jurisdiction, it could go through those plants and find in them literally thousands of men doing non-essential war work which might just as well be done by a woman or an older man, or by a partly disabled man, so that the deferred man could be sent into the service; but they are escaping because they can report to their local boards at home that they are employed by the Curtiss-Wright Co. or some other company making munitions. Their employment may be simply carrying water, or serving as timekeepers, or doing any other sort of work which might as well be done by an older man or a woman. Yet because they can write to their local board at home, possibly hundreds of miles away, telling them they are engaged in essential war work, they are deferred.

If such loopholes as that in the selective service were closed up, and if many Government employees, whose jobs might just as well be filled by older men or women, were sent into the armed services, it would not be necessary to draft married men, particularly married men with children.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will permit me, could not the President of the United States correct that condition if he addressed his attention to it?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not think there is any doubt that it could be corrected.

Mr. HOLMAN. If I may make a further observation, it is time for the President of the United States to take action, and I am getting out of patience with this running all around Robin Hood's barn to find some one responsible for the incompetence of this administration. It is the President of the United States himself who is responsible for the overstaffing of the Federal bureaus and departments, and the wastage of manpower.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Replying to the remarks just made by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], I cannot agree with the implication of the first part of his statement. As I understand the distinguished Senator, he is of the opinion that the Civil Service Commission is gratuitously recruiting and seeking to find workers without prior requests from the different governmental agencies.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What I said was that I had been told by responsible officials in some of the agencies, both permanent departments and temporary agencies, that the Civil Service Commission is coming to them asking if they cannot take 25 or 50 more employees, and I believe that to be true. I know that the Civil Service Commission is actually in practice going around drumming up people to know if they do not want to come to Washington. I can give the Senator many instances of that.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am very positive that the distinguished Senator has been misinformed, and I should like to give specific figures. As of June last year there were unfilled requisitions from the Army and Navy made upon the Civil Service Commission for 4,500 skilled mechanical workers. In other words, the Civil Service Commission had then been unable to find for the Army and Navy 4,500 workers for which the Army and Navy had made requisition. By January that number had risen to 35,000; that is, the Civil Service Commission, as of that date, was 35,000 workers behind in filling the requisition for skilled workers made on it by the Army and the Navy. The Civil Service Commission now is much further behind than that figure with respect to typists, stenographers, and clerks.

Mr. President, in my own State of California alone present military installations lack immediately 50,000 workers who should be working there. During the course of the year the Army and the Navy have notified the Civil Service Com-

mission that they will require a total of 100,000 workers, and I might say that the Civil Service Commissioner of California has told the Army and the Navy that there is no possibility that at any place in the western area can there be found any more men to put into Army and Navy bases.

Let me give some specific figures. At San Bernardino, Calif., we are building one of the greatest air bases in the whole world. It will require 17,000 civilian workers. Though work there has been going on for months, they have not been able to get more than 7,000 workers. The commanding colonel of that base has for months urgently requested people to leave all other types of work to come to that base to work.

In San Francisco we are building a great repair drydock which will require 20,000 workers, among whom must be 7,500 of the very finest type of mechanics, because they must go down into the vital parts of submarines and cruisers and aircraft carriers and repair them. The Civil Service Commissioner of California told me there is not the slightest possibility of finding in the whole world today 7,500 unemployed skilled mechanics such as there are needed, and that there is no possibility of finding any number of the other 13,000 unskilled workers any place in the West.

As a matter of fact, we are building scores of military installations all over the western area. In the West we lack probably 150,000 civilian workers, that being the number the Army and the Navy have made requisition for and that the Civil Service Commission has not been able to find.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, I was referring to the civilian staffing of departments and temporary agencies here. I was not referring to the skilled workmen, or unskilled workmen, men who are actually laborers. I was talking about Government clerks.

Mr. DOWNEY. Take the O. P. A., for instance. It is now estimated that the number of civil-service workers in the O. P. A. will be increased 50 percent between now and July 1. The requisition by the O. P. A. for workers, I may say to the distinguished Senator, is not filled. In other words, the Civil Service Commission is attempting to find and recruit these workers, but not upon its own volition. It is doing it because there are unfilled requisitions amounting to hundreds of thousands among the different agencies, civilian, maritime, Army, and Navy.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator agree yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will except the O. P. A. from any remarks I may have made with respect to the Civil Service Commission, or anyone else, having found, or endeavoring to find, the employees asked for. I do not think it was possible during the incumbency of Mr. Henderson for the Civil Service Commission, or any combination of agencies, to have recruited as many people as Mr.

Henderson thought he ought to have. If they had gotten half a million, or a million workers, Mr. Henderson would still have yelled for more. But I think under former Senator Brown there is likely to be a diminution of requests from the O. P. A.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, while the Senator is on that subject, I will say that I do not have any doubt that there are some departments which could, without serious loss, get rid of some of their personnel. I do not know what departments they are. We speak here in general terms about the departments being full of employees who ought to go into the military service. None of us, however, ever names anyone who ought to go into the military service. I do not know whether any of us knows of any.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I could name one who ought to go into the military service, but not as colonel—Mr. Dave Ginsburg.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the first place it never was suggested that he go into the service as a colonel, and I think the Senator will find that he is not going in either as a colonel or as a captain.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is a consummation devoutly to be wished, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I happen to know, for instance, that the General Accounting Office has been overcrowded with work by reason of the war contracts and everything that has been piled up on them as the result of the war, until they are practically 2,000 employees short of what they need. They probably cannot obtain the 2,000 they need to do that work. It was brought out in the hearings, and here on the floor, that the War Department is short of clerical assistance necessary to get out the checks to the families of soldiers, and that the War Department is unable to get the assistance. What is true of the General Accounting Office and of the War Department undoubtedly is true of other departments. At the same time there are some agencies, and I think the O. P. A. is one of them, where a reduction can be made, and I concur in the belief and the hope that there is going to be a reduction at least in certain types of employees in the O. P. A. But there ought not to be a blanket indictment against all departments and agencies and the charge made that they are overstaffed, for some of them are actually understaffed.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me, or would he rather not?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I will say that anyone who thinks that the number of civilian workers in the O. P. A. will not be magnified over and over again in the next 6 months is an optimist, because in the next 6 months we are going to be rationing almost every article of food and clothing, and the regimentation and bureaucracy required to do what has to be done will be colossal. Anyone is indeed optimistic who thinks they are going to reduce rather than greatly to expand.

I also want to say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, for whom I have

high respect, that I am willing to concede that perhaps workers are being unnecessarily recruited for governmental agencies. I should differ with him, however, to the extent of saying that this is not a gratuitous act on the part of the Civil Service Commission, but it comes about by reason of the requisitions made by the agencies, and they may be acting improperly in certain cases. The Internal Revenue Bureau and its collection offices will have greatly increased business to perform. The amount of business that will have to be transacted under our very complicated revenue measure, and constantly expanding taxes, will require an increase of 50 percent in clerical help over the United States.

I simply wanted clearly to point out to the Senator in what respect I differed with him.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I also wish to call attention to a letter which I received from one of the members of the Railway Labor Executives' Association. He writes:

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: I am writing you to express my personal appreciation and congratulations on your splendid radio address which you delivered Friday, March 5.

I had about given up hope that any responsible Government official would have the courage and understanding to tell the people of this great country the facts concerning the war manpower problem and to explain the fallacy of attempting to build up an Army out of proportion.

During the past year I have served on several committees appointed for the purpose of discussing those subjects with General Hershey, Mr. McNutt, and others, and it has been very disappointing to find there is such a lack of understanding with regard to the realities that confront the Nation in connection with many features that were covered in your radio address.

For example: the railroad industry has been robbed of manpower that will be sorely needed before the end of this year because General Hershey and others in authority seem to have failed to recognize that transportation is one of the greatest factors in promoting a necessary and successful war effort.

During the last war, the transportation problem was, as you know, simple compared to this one because we, in the railroad industry, were fighting what might be called a one-ocean war. Today a large percentage of the products of war industries must be moved from the Middle East and eastern territory to the west coast.

Aside from these features, it seems to me we are in danger of losing the greatest and most important thing in America, and that is home life. It is discouraging, to say the least, that all we receive from the heads of departments in Washington is a bewildering medley of sounds over the air that result in confusion.

At the present time there is a tremendous hue and cry about absenteeism, which is apparently going to be used by some racketeers to again promote prohibition. But not one word is said about the tremendous loss of time through accidents that could have been avoided.

I am pleased that you have introduced a bill which, in my judgment, should receive support. As far as I am personally concerned, it will be supported, although at the present time I am not in a position to speak for our association (the Railway Labor Executives' Association). But I believe they will support your bill. I have written you at some length on this matter, expressing my personal feel-

ings and indicating that so far as I am concerned I shall be glad to help you in any manner I can.

Yours very truly,

T. C. CASHEN.

I now read from a letter which I received from Norwich, Conn.:

I listened to your speech over the Blue Network Friday evening and as an individual citizen and voter, and as chairman of the American Affairs of Norwich Chapter of Hadasah and the Sisterhood of the Beth Jacob Synagogue, of this city, numbering some 600 women voters, do go on record heartily endorsing your sentiments against the passing of any bill which will permit the drafting of fathers of small children.

The American home must be kept intact. We, in this country, do not desire a future race of neglected, underfed, and underprivileged, uncontrolled-behavior children.

We trust you will do all you can to kill the passage of this type of bill.

She seems to believe that there is a bill before the Congress permitting that to be done.

With best wishes for your good health and continued success in behalf of our beloved country's best interest, I am,
Very sincerely yours,

FRANCES E. COHEN.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill referred to is not pending. It was passed, and the law is now upon the statute books.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is correct. When the bill was passed nobody dreamed that it would take married men from their children. If we had been told that it would take married men from their wives and children, it would not have been passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. At the time the bill was passed the Chief of Staff of the Army said that the size of our Army would be 500,000 men.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Nobody thought we were going to have an Army of 11,000,000 men.

Mr. BARKLEY. We were not at war then.

Mr. WHEELER. The testimony was that only 500,000 men would be necessary to defend this country. That was the testimony given before the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would have been enough if no one had attacked us.

Mr. WHEELER. The Chief of Staff told the committee that only 500,000 men would be required in a war to defend the United States.

I now read from a letter which I received from a man who wrote:

I have just completed hearing your radio broadcast and want to assure you that I greatly appreciated the same. You certainly are right and correct in your statements and we need more honest-to-goodness Americans like you.

I went through World War No. 1 and returned home and raised a family of five boys. My oldest son was killed in action on board the U. S. S. Arizona at Pearl Harbor. The next oldest son is somewhere out there in the hell hole now and I am back in the service endeavoring to give everything that I

have to win. I left an elective position to get back into the service and I am past the draft age.

That man was in the last war. One of his sons was killed on the U. S. S. Arizona, and another boy is somewhere in the South Pacific. He writes that he is opposed to the drafting of married men with children.

I now read from a letter received from Rockport, Ind.:

The bill now pending to exempt all fathers from military service is 100-percent approved by the people, and especially those within this category—when I say this I know I speak the minds of millions, the talk is general and the people will not forget those responsible for its passage.

The sooner this bill is passed the better for all concerned, and I can assure you this bill will receive more praise than any other legislation passed or now pending. One of the many very important steps that is up to you and your colleagues, this bill speaks for the people, and by this I know you see through the eyes of the people.

The breaking up of established homes, the induction of these family men into the armed services, should be the last thought of any good thinking man. Conditions will be bad enough as they stand without bringing on this unnecessary hardship. These men will do everything to help our cause along, and if conditions warrant it they will go to the defense factories and farms, as long as they can keep their home together.

Here is a letter from Minnesota:

The American home is the background and backbone of our beloved Nation and it must be protected.

I know that millions of small children are pulling for this bill to be carried to a successful conclusion. I know that you will see it through until it becomes law.

Mr. President, I shall not read any more of these letters, although I will say that those which I have read constitute only a few of the hundreds of letters which I have received. I ask unanimous consent to have a number of those letters printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAY-N-SAVE SUPER MARKET,
Butte, Mont., February 27, 1943.

Senator B. K. WHEELER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: *

However, the thing I wanted to drop you a note about; I wanted to compliment you on your bill that would exempt fathers from being drafted into the Army. While I am on this I want to say that I am not afraid of the Army myself, because I believe that small businessmen would be a lot better off in the Army than they would in business. Although I am past 46 years old, I tried to join the Army and was given the rank of a major in the Procurement Division, and failed to pass the physical.

But in relation to your bill, the real thing that I wanted to say was there have been two people from back here that were over the 38-year-old limit. As I understand it, they are not following the Presidential order to release those men. The way they get out, they play sick and fall out of line and get a medical discharge.

* * * * *
I believe, Senator, to keep fathers out of the Army would render the Army a great service because most fathers would worry

about their families while they are in the service, and would perhaps make very poor soldiers. However, the only way they can be kept out, in my opinion, if we are going to have as big an Army as they say they want, would be to create something like a national pool that would not exempt any whole industry.

For instance, nobody knows this gang on the Anaconda Hill better than you do. Since the copper industry is exempted they file exemptions for clerks, timekeepers, and in one instance I met a young man who was engaged in looking after the foreman's lawn and was deferred for 6 months. That, of course, is all they can get at one time. Names of these will be sent if you want them.

* * *
Best personal regards,
FRANK REARDON.

CLINTON, IOWA, February 25, 1943.
Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: I wish to congratulate you on the bill you introduced prohibiting drafting of fathers until all physically fit single men or married men without children are inducted, and I hope you get enough support to pass the bill.

This would not affect me, as I am 59 years old, but I think it will do more than anything yet introduced to keep up the morale of our country.

If young mothers have to leave their homes and go to work to help support the family, the number of delinquent children will increase enormously.

There are lots of single men and young married men without children here that have not been called, and I do not think this community is any different than many others.

Wishing you success in your efforts to help real Americans, I am

Yours truly,
JOHN B. MULL,
Clinton, Iowa.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., February 25, 1943.
Senator WHEELER.

SIR: Your measure to exempt fathers is one of the most American measures yet proposed. I am a father working in an essential food industry. If I were single, I wouldn't worry, but with two dependents whom you care for you just couldn't make a good soldier while worrying how they are getting along. It just isn't humane to take the bread and butter away from my wife and little girl unless there can't possibly be any way of winning the war without us married men.

According to reports, there are 6,000,000 in the Army. I am sure it would be possible to get another two or three million men without taking married men.

Thanking you for your interest in the families of America,
Sincerely,

WM. V. STROUP, Jr.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

WOODHAVEN, LONG ISLAND, N. Y.,
March 4, 1943.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: Hope you put through a bill to exempt all fathers, prior to Pearl Harbor. My son, 32 years old, has two children, have bought a home on Federal Housing Authority plan. What is to become of the home if such a father is taken? The New Deal is taking everything away from us Americans to give away. We will be reduced to starvation next. Thanks for the stand you take always for the Americans.

Yours truly,
MRS. CHAS. LEHMANN.

EDWARDSVILLE, ILL., March 5, 1943.
Hon. Senator WHEELER.

MY DEAR SIR: To write and congratulate you on your fine radio address of March 5,

evening. I am an ex-service man and of all the radio addresses I have listened to, can truthfully say it was the most sensible and truthful address that could be made.

The whole address was swell. I am 47 years old, ex-serviceman, passed my officers' examination after being out for a while, had automobile sales experience of 15 years, and was called for examination last February 14, 1942, after Pearl Harbor, and could take an officers' place in some Army camp in charge of automobiles and trucks and relieve some younger man, but looks like there is no place for an older man. But I have a son 20 years old who now is at Miami, Fla., as an aviation cadet and was glad and willing to go after 3 years' study at law school, and is disgusting about when an older man could do some good. That is one reason all in all what you said sure was a 100 percent correct.

If more men like you would try and tell this country and get them to understand it would be a lot better for all. As I am 100 percent American.

OLLIE CHRISTMAN.

ARLINGTON, VA., March 8, 1943.
Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: Your speech of March 5, 1943, has brought us an assurance that through your efforts and through the efforts of other Americans interested in defending the American home, something will be done to prevent the drafting of fathers.

I think most American fathers will be more than willing to be placed in war industries. All these men need is a little guidance as to how to proceed and possibly a short period of training and they will flock to war industries.

The Army does not need fathers when they are not using men they already have, some of which have been given expensive specialized training and then stuck away in some camp for the duration or else sent to Washington on jobs any civilian could hold. The survey of young desk officers in Washington is good, but should be extended to Army camps, also.

Very truly yours,
RICHARD M. KLOESER.

BOISE, IDAHO, March 5, 1943.
Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have just listened to your usually good speech and I heartily approve every word you say. I am the father of a son, 36 years old, with a small family, who is serving as a fireman at Gowan Field, our airport here at Boise, and between his work shifts he is busy running a herd of 400 chickens. He and his wife are in the air, not knowing when he will be called. I was out there the other day when he was building another brooder house, and he remarked, "I don't know what Eleanor (his wife) will do with this stuff if they take me into the Army, but I hope you will see her through, Dad." What kind of a soldier do you think he would make in Tunisia or New Guinea? It has been a long time since I heard your voice. I am glad to hear you going on the air again, and I hope to hear you regularly. I also hope the time is not too far off when we may hear Lindbergh again. You and he were right before Pearl Harbor, and I am sure you will be right again.

* * *
I hope and trust my old friend, Senator BUSFIELD, will stand shoulder to shoulder with you in what may well be America's last stand.

Don't be afraid, Senator, to carry on your truly American way of life as I hear people refer to you very kindly who wanted to hang you 18 months ago.

B. H. KANE.

BILLINGS, MONT., March 8, 1943.
Hon. B. K. WHEELER,
United States Senator from Montana,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Both my wife and myself listened to your broadcast the other night with a great deal of interest. We want to congratulate you on your speech. We are glad that someone who holds public office like you do is not afraid to discuss the subject which you covered in your speech. I think more information should be given the public on the same subject. So far as the Selective Service is concerned and its operation, there has been altogether too little information given to the public. So many people will not contact their local draft boards to get information because they are fearful that people generally might think that they were trying to evade something.

We agree with you 100 percent that the American home is the very foundation stone of our Republic. Ex-President Hoover in most of his speeches has always referred to the American home rather than to the American people. We hope you keep up your fight and that you are successful in accomplishing the ends which you have in view.

With kind personal regards, we beg to remain,

Very truly yours,
G. E. SNELL.

TAZEWELL COUNTY, ILL., March 8, 1943.
Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHEELER: I would like to express my compliments and appreciation on behalf of your efforts to prevent the induction of married men into the armed forces.

The break-down in morals, from married men in the service, is daily evident in the administration of my office. It is regrettable that more Members of Congress do not understand the impact against the home that this war inevitably will cause regardless of the drafting of husbands and fathers.

I sincerely hope that you will continue to work to prevent the drafting of fathers and to uphold the integrity of the American home.

Every day I hear intelligent people criticize the policy of drafting such a large army. We know that our allies have millions and millions of trained men who need munitions, and that the efficient thing to do is to send them munitions and not more men. Many of us fear that no good can come from such a large army, and we fear that the Army will not easily relinquish the liberties taken from us when the war is over.

Thank God for courageous men like you. My greatest fear of the future is that there are not enough of them like you in important places. The preservation of the home and our liberties rest with men like you, and I am sure you appreciate this, too.

Sincerely yours,
CLIFFORD E. SCHMIDGALL.

THE CAXTON PRINTERS, LTD.,
Caldwell, Idaho, March 6, 1943.
Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, Montana,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: It seemed good to hear your voice over the air again. Congratulations upon your radio address of last night. Without being an alarmist, I would say that if the present incredible administration continues in power for 2 more years, and pursues the same policies, a lot of Americans are going to be mighty hungry before we can straighten out our agricultural problem.

I know whereof I speak, because Canyon County is one of the richest agricultural counties of the United States, and I am operating a couple of farms myself. It is utterly impossible to get competent help, and to secure machinery. I have been trying for

more than 6 months, for instance, to buy as simple a piece of equipment as a ditcher, and can't secure one anywhere.

Yours truly,

J. H. GIPSON.

ALLIANCE, OHIO, March 8, 1943.

Senator WHEELER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I certainly do want to thank you for the statements you recently made concerning induction of fathers, which I read in a Wayne County newspaper.

I do not think our leaders realize what this is going to do to the American homes of young married folks like my husband and children and I. We have been married nearly 15 years and have two children 14 and 8 and they are at the age where they need both a father and mother's advice, and know that I will be unable to care for them if my husband is taken into service.

I know there are other young mothers worrying about the induction as well as I; we all know this war must be won and us young married folks are willing to do anything else, and sacrifice in any other way than to be parted. I would much rather my husband would have no work and depression be here rather than to lose him.

We went through the other depression and know what it means. My husband has very good work; he is a mechanic in an auto body shop, works 6 days a week, also some evenings repairing cars for defense workers.

You know, as well as thousands of other folks, that these young men of my husband's age are the backbone of America, and their defense shops.

I hardly sleep at night worrying about these things. We moved to Alliance 14 months ago when my husband started in his present work; we rent a home here and also own a home in Wayne County near Orrville, Ohio. His induction, like thousands of other young men, would mean moving again, and many other great changes.

Another thing I would like to point out is the fact that we are all urged to raise a victory garden this summer, which, of course, we have always had but my husband says he does not want to plant a garden here and perhaps move in a few months and leave it; also these men which have families, I know, will be willing to plant large gardens and lots to help food shortage, but if they are taken their families will be unable to do so.

I appeal to you Senators and Members of Congress with tears in my eyes for all the young folks of America to give this induction of fathers great consideration.

Again I appeal, please think it over. I thank you from the bottom of my heart for reading this letter, which I know thousands of other young mothers would like to write concerning this matter but think it would do no good.

Please give us young Americans a chance and we will show you this battle can be won back here by sacrifices and work.

Again I thank you. [Please.]

Yours truly,

Mrs. GLENN KRITES,
628 N. Garfield Ave.,
Alliance, Ohio.

CHICAGO, ILL., March 6, 1943.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Your address was most refreshing, because you present to the American people the other side of the picture. One which they do not hear. Most of the speeches made nowadays sort of try to gloss everything over and are all propaganda for the New Deal side. I am desperately afraid many of us are in for a rude awakening.

The great amount of our trouble today, Mr. WHEELER, is caused by a Congress who forgot

their oaths of office—this is not meant to include yourself and those other patriotic men who forewarned us of the approaching disaster—but those men who voted for all the must bills and voted to remove the Neutrality Act from the books, in the name of peace, and last but not least voted away most of their lawmaking powers until today we have more laws on our statute books by edict than we have by Congress. These are the ones who gave all the power to the bureaucrats, who have just about wrecked us and until this Congress stops talking and gets right down to taking the power of edict away from these men, we will not have anything but chaos.

We don't need all the bureaus, but we do want Congress to carry on its mandate received last November 3 to win this war and do it within the framework of the Constitution. We do not want a 10 percent minority in our country ruling us. We want the elected officials to perform their duties as laid down by our Constitution, and cut out all this talk about world congress, world government, and a dozen other things as a camouflage to change our Government.

We became what we are by nationalism and like Churchill and Stalin we intend to take care of our own, and my advice to Congress is to wake up. All this fourth term stuff is a smoke screen raised to scare our Congress into submission and think the good old days of the New Deal are to stay for another 4 years. I don't think many are foolish enough to believe that. Your effort to keep the family together is wonderful and we pray God you will succeed. Arm the Chinese millions who are crying for arms. But maybe a strong China is not wanted. It looks that way.

The war will be won not by bureaucrats but by the best minds in our country and it is about time they were put to work.

Our prayer is that you and your brave colleagues will carry on; we can and must preserve our Constitution.

Respectfully yours,

(Mrs. GEORGE) ANNA STRONG.

P. S.—We are also violently opposed to Wadsworth-Austin bill—too many loopholes.
A. S.

NEW YORK, February 26, 1943.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In connection with your remarks as mentioned in last evening's papers:

Parents should never be inducted into the armed services excepting as a last resort—the home has made America.

Without the love, devotion and attention of father and mother in the time of youth we would have no worth-while men in the Army or Navy today.

Respectfully,

Mrs. MARGARET GULDEN TITUS.

CHICAGO, U. S. A., March 1, 1943.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: As the subject of manpower is being discussed by the majority of people, and now that a bill has been introduced to exempt all fathers married prior to Pearl Harbor from induction into the armed forces, etc., a couple of questions have arisen which may be of interest to you.

First. To conserve and release manpower why doesn't the military authorities transfer all the commissioned able-bodied men of draft age who were taken from other sections of the country, and are now occupying desk positions to field duty, thereby allowing older men who are residents in said respective areas the privilege and opportunity to do their part by filling those places?

To illustrate: Here in Chicago there are hundreds and possibly thousands of commissioned able-bodied young men of draft

age who have come here from other cities, and are now assigned to office positions. Instructors in the Signal Corps or in other highly technical branches are not included—and neither should they. But those referred to could and should be replaced by the veterans of 1917-19.

The writer personally knows of a number of former non-commissioned officers having 18 or more months of service in the last war (single and married but just over the draft age limit) who have offered their services if they were given a commission of even a second lieutenant and were allowed to remain in this area, but they were told "No" (practically) as they were not given the slightest encouragement of any kind at the various interviews as all the positions were filled with those of draft age.

In my opinion if the red tape for commissions was eliminated, and able-bodied men (either married or single over the draft age) who had previous military service were given commissions and allowed to remain in their respective areas (which would help the housing problem) there would be enough men who would volunteer for military positions in order to release the younger men for field or other duty.

CHICAGO, ILL., March 7, 1943.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Last year there was quite a debate in Congress regarding the drafting of the 18-20 age group, the primary reason being the deferment of the induction of husbands and fathers.

The passage of such a bill was highly recommended by our military men.

Shortly after the passage of this bill, draft officials gave statistics which indicated that the pool created by the 18-20 age group plus husbands without children would be almost entirely sufficient to fill the draft quota for this year.

Now these same officials tell us it will be necessary to draft thousands of fathers within the next few months, particularly those who are in nonessential employment.

I doubt very much whether there are any fathers who are not willing to answer the call to the colors, but from a morale standpoint, contradictory statements concerning their induction are certainly not very constructive, not to mention the material they furnish to the enemy for propaganda purposes.

Maybe the reverses of the German Army in Russia are due to the fact that on account of losses they have been forced to call on that portion of their army composed of husbands and fathers, whose bodies are on the battlefronts, but whose souls and spirit were left with their wives and children at home.

Again, because of physical standards, those fathers who have realized their family obligations of maintaining a physical status quo, will be inducted into the armed services, while their bachelor counterpart has been deferred on account of physical deficiencies, in large part probably due to fast living which such individuals preferred to assuming family obligations.

Then too, these are the men this Nation will entrust with the obligations governing our future generations.

History might show us that conditions prevailing today were the result of incompetents we deferred during the last war and whom we left at home to run things while the real manhood of our Nation was at the fighting front. At any rate, this certainly might be food for thought for our post-war planners.

In conclusion, let the fathers of this country know definitely where they stand, and they'll give you a degree of cooperation which will dwarf all other cooperative measures in comparison.

Not trying to be ironical, wasn't the author of Germany's last post-war plans a man who did not feel capable of assuming family obligations?

Very truly yours,

EDWARD C. JOCHENS.

SACK LUMBER & COAL CO.,
Crete, Nebr., March 6, 1943.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Have been waiting to write you a long time regarding the matter of drafting married men with children into the Army. It is just as foolish to draft these men with established homes and little children as it was to draft men from the farm who were past 35 years old and later these men were returned home. When these men left their farms many had a lot of livestock which they sold and now they have returned to nothing because they were too old for the Army.

The same is true of married men with children. These men can do more good on the home front at their job and they can also fill in out in this State at least to help farmers harvest their crops. I do not belong in the group of married men with children and way past the age limit, so I am not speaking for myself. There is a moral and an economic situation that is weakening on the home front. We cannot have too many vacant stores and shops, and who is to do the farm work and other essential work if all able men are taken? After all, the home people must be fed and clothed. Men in high places should keep their ears close to the ground, as that is one way of knowing the true situation. I hope you can get our Congress to look at the situation from this angle. There is a limit to what a man can do.

Yours respectfully,

PHILIP SACK, Jr.

NEW YORK, N. Y., March 5, 1943.

Senator B. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have just listened to your address on the air, and am writing to tell you that I agree with you completely. It does seem unreasonable to destroy here the very thing we are sending our boys all over the world to preserve in other countries.

Then, too, there certainly is a limit to the amount any one nation, however favored, can do.

It seems to me there is the financial angle to consider, too, when fathers are drafted. The fathers are usually the ones who pay the income tax. When they are taken into the service, naturally, they can't earn their regular salaries, and consequently there isn't so much income tax to be paid. The Government not only loses this money, but also has to add to its burden the monthly payments to the wives and children. If you keep on reducing the income, how can you continue to expand the disbursements?

I feel that fathers should be trained and put into the defense industries. Most men are mechanically minded and learn machine operations quickly, and thus make the single men available for service, though, goodness knows, we hate it that any of them have to go.

I am writing Senator WAGNER from my own State, asking that he vote in favor of your bill.

Yours truly,

HELEN A. ROSE,
(Mrs. T. R. ROSE).

P. S.—Saving paper in these days of rationing.

I have called to Senator WAGNER's attention an incident that closely relates to this subject. On February 15, when New York had 8° below zero weather, a 6-family house

on Warburton Avenue, Yonkers, was burned because 2 children, left alone while their mother was out working, decided to heat up the place by making a bonfire in the kitchen. The mother worked in a defense plant and the father was, to the best of my knowledge, in the service.

THE HOUSE OF RILEY,

Los Angeles, Calif., March 6, 1943.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am in complete sympathy with you in your fight to dispense with the drafting of fathers with minor children, and men in key positions. I have been observing the great number of young men who are in fine physical condition who can stand up under any type of warfare, and who now in the military police, the service of supply, and other work that can be done by men such as myself, men who have been rejected in the 38 to 45 class.

It is my opinion that at least 1,000,000 men, veterans of the last war, would be glad to have the opportunity to serve their country again in such work as military police, truck drivers, in fact, any kind of service that does not require a lot of hiking, and I do think the men in this age class are better fitted for this kind of service than the younger men.

All these men have had military training and it would be very easy for them to fall right into line in this new Army. I for one have had training in all the new drills and could be a lot of help in training these older men such as myself.

I am now a captain in the State militia and feel I should have a place in the regular service, as I am only 43 years of age and I think I am a damn good man; also I know thousands of others who feel the same way as I. Perhaps I should have written to the Senator from California but I feel I am one of your charges, having lived in Montana for some time and still have folks living at Opheim, so please forgive me for bothering you with my thoughts, and may God bless you and help you in all of your undertakings.

Yours respectfully,

EARL E. RILEY.

BALTIMORE, Md., March 8, 1943.

Senator BURTON WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: I was very much impressed with your broadcast last week regarding the draft bill.

I happen to be a veteran of the last war and a past commander of the American Legion, and in making the following suggestion, I know that I speak for thousands of other veterans.

Instead of taking single men from the ages of 38 to 45, why not give some of the older men who have had both military and business experience an opportunity to do their part? I quote my own case, which you will find most unusual.

I am 48 years old, with over 25 years' experience on internal-combustion engines, a former world champion outboard motorboat racer, and in excellent physical condition, as I have taken two Army examinations. Originally, my application was filed with the Army Air Corps at Philadelphia, with all the necessary recommendations, and was approved for captaincy. This took place in August of last year, and in October I had occasion to go to Washington on business and was informed that my file had been lost. In the meantime, however, the Army Air Corps was closed to civilians. My file was then transferred to the Specialist Corps. Was approved for captain on Friday—Saturday this corps was abolished. My file was then transferred to the Ordnance Department and I received a Government order to report for officers' candidate training at the Normoyle Motor Base, San Antonio, Tex. Received my certificate

of graduation, and was told to go back to Chicago and await orders. At that time, I was also told that there was a definite spot for me as it was difficult to find men with my particular experience. Sometime later, I received a letter from Washington with information to the effect that due to a change in Army regulations, no further commissions will be issued for the Ordnance Department.

It was necessary for me to return to Washington last week, and I am now trying to get into the Engineers Corps. They have my complete file.

Not only have I spent valuable time trying to get into the service, but it has cost me approximately \$500 in doing so. There is no question in my mind, Senator, that there are thousands of other veterans like myself who want to do their part but cannot because, obviously, nowadays it isn't what you know that counts but whom you know. We could so easily take over positions in offices, factories, and Army bases now being occupied by the young officers. You see these young men all over the country, handling office jobs, etc., when they should by all means be serving overseas in active duty.

I know you are a very busy person, Senator, and probably won't even have time to read this letter, but I simply had to express my thoughts to someone and when I heard your splendid speech the other evening, decided to make you my victim. You can appreciate what I've gone through, and perhaps your good work will enable us old timers to do our bit to win final victory.

Respectfully,

ARTHUR C. JACOBS,
Wilton Tool Corporation, Chicago, Ill.

STUEBENVILLE, OHIO, March 3, 1943.

HON. SENATOR WHEELER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: Regarding the legislation which you recently introduced, I have been reading the newspaper accounts, and I would like to offer you my thoughts, which you will see indicate that I am willing to do my bit.

The opposition says that if your bill were passed, the services would have to take single men between 38 and 45. Well, what's wrong with them?

Clark Gable seems to be doing all right, and he's over age. Then there is Gene Tunney, Jack Dempsey, and probably a great many more. Is it possible that only these men are physically fit? There are thousands of men who are between 38 and 45 who certainly can be of service.

It so happens that I am 40 years old. I am married, but we have no children. My wife is 36, a registered nurse.

Last July I applied for a commission in the post exchange service. I went to Fort Snelling and passed the physical satisfactorily. I was recommended for moderate service. I was not accepted, yet I took the place of a man who also applied for a commission and was given a captaincy. I have sufficient years of experience in my line to qualify me, having managed some large stores with organizations of over 100 employees. I have had a course in double-entry bookkeeping. Managed luncheonettes. In fact, have done a much better job right here in my present position than my predecessor, but I am not given the same opportunity to serve. Why?

I am 40 years old. I could easily do the work that is required in post exchange. I could relieve some Regular officer who is of troop age.

I was in Washington last August, and, frankly, I was amazed at the thousands of youthful officers who are located there.

With the cost of living so high, and the extreme hardships that a man with children has to endure, it seems to me that the Army and the Navy should comb their noncombatant ranks for these young men and get

them in where they are needed and let a few older men serve their country at least in these jobs that do not require a commando physique.

Another thing, why does the Navy require a man to have 2 years of college to be an officer? I also wrote to them but was advised that my professional qualifications were insufficient. The very next day I noticed where a store manager was given a commission as junior lieutenant. I have not had the privilege of a college education, but I have been able to advance myself in the retail merchandising field to a position that enables me to pay an income tax on \$7,700 this year, a lot more than a lot of college graduates will make.

Before we begin to cause a lot of unnecessary suffering on the part of women and children, let's get rid of some of this ridiculous red tape. Let's find out what jobs men 38 to 45 can do and then draft them for those jobs, and let's see a few less boys and more men in Washington.

J. L. KAUFMAN.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I appreciate that in speaking today with reference to this subject I am probably talking in vain. I know that there is a feeling in the Congress that we must do anything and everything that the Army and the executive branch of the Government say we should do. Unless the Congress of the United States has the intestinal stamina to stand up and take away some of the powers which it has given to bureaucrats in the executive departments of the Government, our Government will be destroyed. Do not make any mistake about it. We are headed for chaos in this country just as sure as we are sitting in this Chamber. If we take the married men of the country away from their families and break down home life, watch and see what will happen to the United States. It is simply idiotic to think of doing anything of the kind.

As I have already said, I know that my small voice raised here this afternoon will not be heeded by the gentlemen at the other end of the Avenue. However, I, at least, would have it on my conscience if I did not stand on the floor of the Senate and protest, not in behalf of the mothers or fathers but in behalf of the children of America—the future generations which will be turned out of their homes—turned over to institutions, and taken away from the care of their mothers and fathers, while the mothers are employed in factories.

Who is there among us who does not know what will happen to the homes of America? Yet, we are told that we are fighting to preserve the American way of life, that we are fighting to preserve the homes of America. Those are our good intentions. Mr. President, when the people of this country see us take away the heads of families and see the homes breaking down, they will say, "Oh, you may have had good intentions, but hell is paved with good intentions."

We should stop it. We in Congress should have the courage to stop it. If it is not stopped by those down at the other end of the Avenue, we in Congress should have the courage to say, "You cannot take the married men from their families until every other resource has been exhausted." However, as all Members of the Senate and everyone else in

the country knows, every other resource has not been exhausted.

What are we to do? Are we to sit idly by, and say, "We will not vote to put a stop to it," because some general in the Army does not approve of our doing so? Are we afraid to do it because we fear criticism? Are we to say that we will not do it, when in our hearts and souls and minds we know that that which is proposed is wrong, and that there would be no excuse for doing it if the law had been properly administered?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have a great deal of sympathy for the Senator's amendment, and I am in agreement with many of the things he has said today; but I hope the Senator will not press his amendment. I do not think it would be fair to him or to the cause in which he is so greatly interested or to the Senate to take a vote on such an important piece of legislation as the Senator's amendment, as a rider to another bill.

The bill the Senate has before it today is, without the Senator's amendment, comparatively a very small measure. The Senator's amendment is a thousand times larger than the original bill.

The Senator's amendment has not been considered by a Senate committee. The effect it would have upon the war effort and upon the armed forces of the country has not been weighed and considered. No testimony has been taken on it. I do not think it is fair to bring it up now and to ask us to vote on it at this time.

Speaking for myself, and only for myself, while perhaps under other circumstances I would be in ardent support of the Senator's amendment, yet if I had to vote on it this afternoon I would oppose it. I presume that other Senators would find themselves in the same position. Then what would happen? The country would say "That is the voice of Congress. Congress passed upon the measure and brought in their verdict."

That is the word that the Selective Service System would receive; that is the word the Army would receive; that is the word the administration and the Executive would receive.

So, under the present circumstances, I hope that the amendment—meritorious though it be—will not be voted upon at this time by the Senate.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Colorado was out of the Chamber at the time when the distinguished Democratic leader and also my good friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] appealed to me in the same way that the Senator from Colorado has now appealed to me. I said to them that I would finish my speech and then would withdraw the amendment at this time. The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs has assured me that his committee will take up the matter and will give it consideration in the near future.

The only difficulty is that a start is already being made to take married men into the armed forces. Something

should be done about the matter by the Committee on Military Affairs. The committee should take up the matter immediately, before married men are taken indiscriminately. All the single men in the country should be taken before any married men are taken. The Committee on Military Affairs should go into that subject immediately, before we have chaos in the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I agree with what the Senator has said, and I thank him and congratulate him for the exercise of his good judgment in not pressing for a vote on the amendment at this time.

Speaking only as one member of the Committee on Military Affairs, I promise the Senator that I will do everything in my power to bring about an early consideration of his amendment, and in the committee shall urge that hearings be held on the matter, and that it be very carefully and speedily considered.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me say in closing—

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. NYE. Before the Senator closes, since he has made so eloquent a representation concerning the chaos toward which we are riding, I know that he must be entertaining in his mind the same question that is in mine. Perhaps he has answered the question to his own satisfaction; but I am wondering what is the occasion or the need for a military establishment of 11,000,000 men, in the light of what we know to be the facts concerning the number of people involved in the war. Germany, Japan, and Italy have a total population of 196,000,000. They constitute the Axis. They are the people we have to defeat. They are the people we want to defeat. They are the target of the 11,000,000-man military force which we are talking about.

Aiding us, presumably, in the task of conquering those 196,000,000 people are the people of the British Empire, of Russia, of China, and of the United States—comprising a total of 1,286,000,000 people, as against the enemy of 196,000,000 people. Yet we—not the allies, but we, the people of the United States—alone must furnish an Army of 11,000,000 men—evidently a military establishment of 11,000,000 men—in order to accomplish the conquest.

Can the Senator explain why the obligation to do that job is so greatly ours?

Mr. WHEELER. Perhaps I could; but the hour is growing late, and I hesitate to say now what I think about the matter.

Let me say quite frankly that since we entered the war no one has heard me raise my voice on the floor of the Senate in criticism of the conduct of the war. I must confess that I hesitated for a long time before I offered the amendment or before I made a radio address relative to it or even before I made this speech on the floor of the Senate. I hate to criticize the administration. I am not going to criticize Mr. McNutt. I am not going to criticize any particular branch of the Government. But certainly when I see—as I think I plainly

see, and as I think everyone else who has traveled through the country sees—the bitterness and the growing dissatisfaction with the way things are going, and the chaos in the manpower situation, and then hear the demand for 11,000,000 men and hear statements to the effect that the little businessmen engaged in nonessential war production will have to close their doors, and that we shall have to take the married men with children, I think I know what will be the result.

This administration has done a great deal for the security of the home. We have passed the home-owners' loan bill, we have passed much other legislation to bring about security for the home. The Democratic Party and administration have gone on record as being willing to help the underprivileged in the United States. They have said we are against the great corporations and money changers. Yet today you are putting out of business the small businessman and turning all business over to the big interests of the country; you are building up the big interests, destroying the little interests, and destroying the home. Is it because some of the New Dealers have adopted the same philosophy that has been adopted in Russia, that a few big interests are easier to regulate and easier to take over than the small businesses? Is that the philosophy?

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERGUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. The Senator looks at other Senators and says "You," meaning us, presumably, as doing all these things. I contend that it is the President of the United States who is responsible for this condition.

Mr. WHEELER. Some one is responsible for it. I say you are responsible and I am responsible, Congress is responsible. Congress is responsible because Congress has not had the courage to stand up and say no. We have granted vast powers, and turned over money carte blanche by the millions and millions of dollars. We are responsible because we have not exercised the power we were directed by the Constitution to exercise. We have turned it over carte blanche to officials in the Executive branch. That is why there is the waste and extravagance in the departments which exist.

Mr. HOLMAN. If the Senator will yield further, the New Deal majority may be responsible, but, as a minority member who has been active in working on appropriations, and was responsible a few days ago for cutting the Treasury Department appropriation 25 percent on the general principle that extravagance should be curbed, I do not wish to assume that responsibility further.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not take the Senator as an individual, but I say that the Republicans have been just as responsible as have the Democrats.

Mr. HOLMAN. Oh, listen; there are some New Deal Republicans, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, as I was saying, I am not standing here today and making these remarks because I want to criticize the administration, or because I want to criticize what has been done. But when one sees his country headed for chaos so far as manpower is concerned, how could he sit here, how could anyone sit here, and not raise his voice in protest?

While I was trying to keep the country out of war, when I was speaking at the Biltmore Hotel in Los Angeles, I was asked, "Why is it that your speeches are carried in the German press?" I said, "I do not know that they are, because I do not read German and I do not see their press." But a few days ago I noticed something in the press about *The Grapes of Wrath*. That was a book embraced by all the "inside" boys in Washington, the great liberals, as one of the greatest books of the century; and it was a great book. But in a newspaper clipping a few days ago I saw that Steinbeck's book was being run in serial form in Germany, in Italy, and in Russia. So the New Dealers should cut Steinbeck off their list and should tar and feather him, because not only is his book being run in serial form, but the picture itself, I am told by the press, is being run in the motion-picture houses at least in Italy and in some other countries.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator will recognize that that story was made into a movie, and it was shown in the theaters in the United States.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not suppose the Government of the United States, or anyone connected with it, would be responsible if the Italian people bought the film through the motion-picture industry.

Mr. WHEELER. Do not misunderstand me; I am not blaming the United States or anyone in the United States. I am merely calling attention to the fact that many people are criticizing some Senators because something we may have said got into the German press.

I am not blaming Steinbeck or anyone else, but I am saying that his book is being run in serial form in the newspapers in foreign countries, because Russia has always picked out everything that was bad about this country, as the Senator knows, and published it and carried it over the radio—not the things that were good. The same thing has happened in Germany and Italy, and the same thing is found generally in all countries throughout the world.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to refer to a statement he made a short time ago about the small businessman going out of business, the Communist theory has always been that the greatest obstacle to communism is the small capitalist, the small manufacturer.

Mr. WHEELER. And the farmer.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The farmer, the small storekeeper, and the family; that if they can destroy the family, the small capitalist, the petite bourgeoisie, as they call it, then the road is broken on the way to communism.

A few days ago I learned, at least it was reported in the press, that there are approximately 45 various bureaus established in this country by this Government to help the small businessman. The way the small businessman is going out of business one would almost think the effort being made was to help small businessmen out of business.

Every day I receive letters from small businessmen and small manufacturers who cannot get any contracts because they are so small. If they had capital of less than ten or fifteen or twenty-five, or fifty million dollars, they were too small. The contracts were let to about 240 corporations, the amount running to about \$30,000,000,000. Of the first \$15,000,000,000 of contracts that were let, 85 percent were let to 15 large corporations. Consequently they got priorities, and they are still getting priorities. The small manufacturer could not get any priorities and could not get any material, so the large industries got priorities and manpower and put the small man out of business.

A great deal has been said in this country about people who have such great foresight about what was to come in the world. When they started to tell us about their great foresight all they said was, "All we have to do is to give the men the tools and they will do the job." At that time they did not mention the prospect of 11,000,000 men in the armed forces.

Where is the foresight? The first move was for 500,000 men to defend the United States. Where is the foresight in putting out of business the small manufacturer, the small businessman, the small capitalist, who has been the foundation and the pillar of strength to uphold a democratic form of government?

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota, and I agree with him entirely.

Mr. President, I realize thoroughly that when the United States entered the war we were quite unprepared for it. I do not think anyone in particular is to blame for that condition, either the administration or the Congress itself. Everyone is to blame for it. Perhaps many of the things we criticize today were unavoidable, because when so great an organization as we had to set up is set up in a short time, there are bound to be a great many errors creep into it, unavoidable errors. But certainly today, when we see some of the errors which have crept into the organization, when we see the waste and extravagance which has taken place, we should correct the situation.

We know that officials have said that married men will be drafted, and that the drafting of married men will be begun immediately. Chairman McNutt and other officials say that four-fifths of the married men who are physically fit will be taken. When we know that, then at least we should stand up here and say that something should be done about it. Various officials have served notice that they are going to take physically fit married men. I hope they will not do it. I hope that before they start

in to take the married men with children, they will again review the situation calmly and coolly, that they will review the question of taking single men, if necessary, out of the factories, that they will look into the question of taking single men, or men without dependents, without children, men between the ages of 38 and 45, and before they take married men with children they will even take men above 45, take men even up to 60 or 65 to replace some of the younger men, and do work which older men can do, thus preserving the American family.

Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment, as it has been suggested I do by the distinguished leader on the Democratic side, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the leader on the Republican side, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I have at the desk an amendment I propose to offer to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. I now offer that amendment, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the amendment of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

Sec. 3. Section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(m) Whenever the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation certifies to the Selective Service System that there is a shortage or threatened shortage of necessary transportation workers in any area, and that as a result thereof there is grave danger that the war effort will be delayed and disrupted because of the inability to maintain proper and adequate transportation facilities and services in such area, each registrant in such area who is employed substantially full time as a bona fide transportation worker, as determined under regulations to be prescribed by the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation and certified to the Selective Service System, shall be deferred by his selective-service local board from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States so long as such registrant continues to be so employed."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have given notice of an amendment which I propose to offer, but my amendment is in the nature of a substitute for the Johnson substitute amendment. I should like to get my amendment officially before the Senate, although not to supersede the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY].

Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. Is it not proper, if I receive unanimous consent, to offer my amendment in the nature of a substitute, and to have it remain on the desk, and be before the Senate, to be called up at an appropriate time subsequent to action

upon the amendment of the able Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer my amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I should like to clarify the parliamentary situation. Does the Senator's request contemplate that the Downey amendment shall be considered before the substitute of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. PEPPER. My request is that my amendment, in the nature of a substitute, be received by the Senate and be a pending amendment before the Senate, but I am not asking for actual consideration of it at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there cannot be two questions pending at the same time. What the Senator from Florida should do, I think, is to ask that he be permitted to present his substitute for the information of the Senate, and have it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. PEPPER. No, Mr. President; that has already been done. My substitute has not as yet been offered. It is not one of the amendments to the bill which is before the Senate. I understood that the amendment could lie on the table subject to being called up.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it would have to be called up and offered formally. It might lie on the table forever and not be brought up unless it were called up. The point is that there can only be one pending question before the Senate at one time. Of course, I have no objection to the Senator from Florida offering his substitute, but what he is seeking to do is to have it pending at the same time that the amendment offered by the Senator from California is pending. While we can do many things in the Senate by unanimous consent, we cannot have more than one question pending at the same time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President—

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I claim the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Why could not the Senator from Florida ask that at the conclusion of the Senate's action on the Downey amendment his substitute be next in order?

Mr. PEPPER. I think that would meet what I have in mind, if that is satisfactory, and if unanimous consent may be granted to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment will be in order after the amendment of the Senator from California shall have been disposed of.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, is the Senator from California going to speak?

Mr. DOWNEY. I am going to speak, unless some Senator desires to make a request.

Mr. HILL. I should like to make a very brief statement.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, was my request granted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] will be in order after the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] to the Johnson amendment is acted on.

Mr. BARKLEY. Just a moment, Mr. President. Let us clear up the parliamentary situation. It would be in order for the Senator from Florida to seek recognition and to be recognized to offer his substitute, which will then become the pending question, following the disposition of the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from California now yield to me?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

DAVID C. GINSBURG

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, yesterday I was very much surprised to see the Washington News carry a picture of Mr. David Ginsburg, the General Counsel of the O. P. A., and a statement that Mr. Ginsburg was resigning from the O. P. A. and would be given a commission as colonel in the Army. I could not think it was possible that Mr. Ginsburg or any other civilian would be given a colonel's commission in the Army. So I contacted our former colleague, Mr. Prentiss Brown, now the Administrator of the O. P. A., and asked him if the story were correct, and if not, if he would give me the facts in the matter. Former Senator Brown advised me that Mr. Ginsburg had not been considered for a colonel's commission; that he has been under consideration for a captain's commission in the Army. He advised me furthermore that Mr. Ginsburg himself had never asked for any deferment under the draft on account of occupation, on account of the fact that he held the position as General Counsel or any other position with the O. P. A.

In fact, Mr. Ginsburg is a married man, with a dependent wife, and certainly during most of the period of the draft he would have been entitled to deferment as a married man with a dependent wife, because, as we know, it is only recently that the Selective Service System has been taking married men with dependent wives.

I believe the Senate should know that Mr. Henderson, as head of the O. P. A., asked for Mr. Ginsburg's deferment because of the position Mr. Ginsburg held in the O. P. A. In my opinion such request was never necessary, because Mr. Ginsburg was entitled to be deferred, and would have been deferred, as a married man with a dependent wife.

On January 19, 1943, which was some 7 or 8 weeks ago, Mr. Ginsburg wrote a letter to former Senator Brown, Administrator of the O. P. A., in which he tendered his resignation as General Counsel of the O. P. A. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in full

in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 19, 1943.

PRENTISS BROWN, Esq.,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PRENTISS: This is my resignation, to be accepted at your convenience.

From what has gone before I realize that your first inclination will probably be to hand the letter back to me with instructions to forget the matter and go to work. But before your decision is made I want you to read carefully what I have to say, and to think about it.

Your job is tougher even than you believe. Time will reveal this. When we spoke by telephone I tried to give you some intimation of what lay ahead, but words alone don't cut deep enough. Directly or indirectly, sooner or later, every organized special interest and pressure group in the country will bring its power to bear on you—first by what will appear to be appeals to reason, then by threats, and if need be by force. Every decision which affects them adversely will come to be challenged before you or the Congress or the public as a threat to the war effort or the public interest perpetrated by a college professor or an inexperienced young lawyer. The adjectives and the epithets may change as the character of the staff changes, but so long as the ruling remains adverse the challenge will also remain. They will try to divide you from your staff, and then try to undermine you and your staff separately. As a symbol of Office of Price Administration, and in order to preserve the loyalty and support of your people, it will be your obligation to defend them as you defend yourself. It will be harder because you will have inherited the organization.

You must therefore decide now or soon what and whom you will defend. Office of Price Administration, I recognize, may have some defects in organization and personnel—defects in the sense that a better job perhaps could be done in another way or by another person. For this reason you are not called upon privately to underwrite everything and everyone in Office of Price Administration, whatever public position you may take. But Office of Price Administration is also vulnerable, if not defective, in another quarter. My own position illustrates this second kind of problem, and that's what I want to bring to your attention.

I combine in myself almost every handicap that can be brought to an important public office in a war agency in January 1943. I am a New Deal Democrat; I am a Jew; and I am young—31 in April. As a result of my youth, incidentally, I shall almost certainly be attacked as a draft-dodger. This would hurt me fearfully, and hurt many others who are unknown to me. Only the President can forestall this, but it is doubtful whether he would choose to do so.

Shifts in policy may be expedient, yet I feel so deeply that success in our work depends on our hanging on, that instinctively I should tend to oppose or qualify such shifts or compromises.

Lastly, I am physically tired and a little dispirited. I'm almost ashamed to say this, because we are at war, but it is important that you should see the picture whole. I've been on the job more than 2½ years, and most of my weeks have had "long working days in them. I don't begrudge that. Indeed, I'm proud of my share of what we've accomplished. But there's a limit to what people can take and still do their job effi-

ciently. Maybe the work needs fresh minds, and the public new faces.

These are all reasons, moreover, why the prospect of a place in the Army is appealing. I do recognize, of course, the dangers to the Office of Price Administration of a shift now in the top staff, but all of us, I know, would do our very best to minimize those dangers. What I want to get across, however, is that my case presents you with special considerations which you must consider separately from others, and that I am offering you my resignation without reservation or qualification of any kind.

Yours sincerely,

DAVID GINSBURG,
General Counsel.

Mr. HILL. I quote briefly from the letter of Mr. Ginsburg to former Senator Brown.

I combine in myself almost every handicap that can be brought to an important public office in a war agency in January 1943. I am a New Deal Democrat; I am a Jew; and I am young—31 in April. As a result of my youth, incidentally, I shall almost certainly be attacked as a draft dodger. This will hurt me fearfully, and hurt many others who are unknown to me.

The letter closes with these words:

I am offering you my resignation without reservation or qualification of any kind.

Yours sincerely,

DAVID GINSBURG,
General Counsel.

Mr. President, I have a statement which Mr. Brown, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, released yesterday in connection with Mr. Ginsburg, in the matter of his service with the O. P. A., and his leaving the service. I ask that the statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 11, 1943.

The following statement was issued today by Price Administrator Prentiss M. Brown:

"I have just been informed that attacks have been made on Mr. David Ginsburg, general counsel of the Office of Price Administration, with respect to his plan to enlist in the United States Army and the probability that he might obtain a commission as a captain for service abroad. I feel in justice to Mr. Ginsburg that I should make the following statement:

"When the Office of Price Administration was set up, to my personal knowledge I know that Mr. Ginsburg contributed tremendously to the organization. He was one of the main factors in holding the price line at a time when there was no statutory authority to do so. In the drafting of the first act, his advice was considered by the subcommittee in the Senate to be of great value. His knowledge of the situation and the need for the legislation was unusual, and it is my judgment that he performed a great service for his country in his capacity as adviser to Mr. Henderson. He was appointed general counsel and served until the present.

"Upon my taking office, he gave me his resignation and strongly urged that I accept it. He gave me his reasons for it. I did not accept his resignation because I considered him the best informed man in the Office of Price Administration. After I had been here for some weeks, I came to certain conclusions as to the course I should pursue. I told Mr. Ginsburg what my views were and told him that I would be delighted to have him continue, but wanted him to know that

I had certain changes in mind and asked him whether or not he could go along with those changes. This was on Thursday, March 4. It was understood that he would think the matter over and on Friday the 5th he advised me that he thought it would be in the best interests of the office for me to accept his resignation because while he thought he might go along with the policy he feared at times there might be differences of opinion and that he felt also a desire to go into the Army. I told him to be certain that he was making the right decision and then left the matter to him. On Saturday morning he asked me to write a letter to his draft board advising that I would release him from Office of Price Administration. I did so. I considered that as long as Mr. Ginsburg was willing to follow my general policies, he was indispensable to this organization and would have informed the authorities if necessary.

"Our personal relations are most friendly and he has performed a great service for his country in this office."

Mr. HILL. I also have a brief summary which has been compiled for me by Mr. Brown, concerning the status of Mr. David Ginsburg under the Selective Service Act. I ask that this summary be also printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Mr. Ginsburg is registered with Local Board No. 10, 1622 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. His order number is 3068.

2. In the summer of 1941 Mr. Ginsburg filed a routine questionnaire with his selective-service board indicating dependency—not occupation—as the basis for his classification.

3. On August 16, 1941, the Office of Price Administration filed Selective Service Form 42 with Mr. Ginsburg's local board requesting his deferment as a necessary man in the defense program.

4. On August 16, 1941, the board placed Mr. Ginsburg in class II-A for 6 months. This was probably error; he should have been classified in III-A because of dependency.

5. On January 15, 1942, Mr. Henderson filed Form 42-A with the local board requesting deferment in class II-B.

6. On January 19, 1942, the local board notified Mr. Ginsburg he had been tentatively placed in class I, subject to physical examination. However, on March 6, 1942, the local board finally placed Mr. Ginsburg in class II-A for 6 months (until September 6, 1942).

7. On September 3, 1942, Mr. Henderson filed Form 42-A with the local board requesting Mr. Ginsburg's classification in II-B.

8. On September 24, 1942, the local board placed Mr. Ginsburg in class III-B, his present classification. This is a dependency classification. The board evidently reconsidered its original decision on dependency and decided that the original classification in class II-A was incorrect.

9. At no time did Mr. Ginsburg himself ever ask for deferment because of his job. The office regarded him as indispensable; those who know his contributions to and place in the organization have no doubt regarding the correctness of that decision.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection I think it ought to be stated that my information is that the consideration of Mr. Ginsburg in connection with a captain's commission was not initiated by

him at all. I am informed that it was initiated by a high officer in the War Department who desired to utilize Mr. Ginsburg's services, and went to him to suggest the possibility of having him appointed a captain in the Army of the United States.

Mr. HILL. I wish to thank the Senator from Kentucky for his contribution.

PRODUCTION OF FOODSTUFFS—PLEDGE OF DUBOIS COUNTY (IND.) FARMERS

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, many Dubois County, Ind., farmers have joined in solemn pledge not to accept any payments from our Government, and to produce the greatest amount of essential foodstuffs possible for the duration of the war. They believe that the universal adoption of this course would release billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money for much needed national defense. They also believe that it would release for other and much more important defense work thousands of able-bodied men who are now on the Government payrolls telling farmers what they may and may not plant. I ask unanimous consent to have the pledge printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the pledge was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DUBOIS COUNTY, IND.

Believing that we should so live that we may look our children and those of our soldier wounded in the face when they come home with an unbothered conscience and not having failed them because we let the tax eaters and Agricultural Adjustment Administration pay-roll patriots administer a debt- and interest-burdened prosperity to us as farmers.

Believing that the taxpayers of the Nation are about to shoulder the greatest interest-bearing tax burdens in our history which our children and our returning soldiers will inherit from us, and believing also that economy should be practiced in our Government as well as in our household, we, as patriotic farmers of Dubois County, Ind., do hereby pledge ourselves to refrain from the acceptance of any Government Agricultural Adjustment Administration dole payments for the growing or nongrowing and restriction of acreage of any crops, livestock, etc., on our respective farms.

And, consistent with this undertaking and in a spirit of contributing in every possible manner to the cause of victory and of national abundance, security, and stability, we further pledge ourselves to produce to the limit of our ability all the things which we are best equipped to produce.

MEMBERS OF THE FARMERS GUILD.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS—CURTAILMENT OF NEWSPRINT

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, recently I issued a statement following a study of the growing increase in the use of paper by Federal agencies. The study, which attracted a good deal of attention throughout the country, was undertaken in connection with a report that there was a shortage of paper. I have not heretofore offered to the Senate the figures which were compiled. I find them to be included in an editorial printed in the Chicago Herald-American of March 10, 1943, and I ask that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRYING TO STARVE PRESS FREEDOM

Senator RAYMOND E. WILLIS, of Indiana, has charged the Federal Government with "disgracefully and shamefully" increasing its own use of printing paper, while curtailing newsprint consumption by newspapers and magazines to an extent threatening the active functions of the free American press.

Senator WILLIS supports his charge by citing official records.

In 1941, he recites, the Federal Government contracted for 117,173,000 pounds of paper, and actually used 208,900,000 pounds.

In 1942, the Government contracted for 187,850,000 pounds of paper, and used 226,000,000 pounds.

In 1943, the Government has contracted for 350,000,000 pounds of paper—which, as Senator WILLIS says, is "60 percent more than actually consumed in 1941, the year which American newspapers and magazines are asked to use as an even-then-scaled-down base period for determining their consumption in 1943."

In other words, the Government proposes to use more than half again as much printing paper in 1943 as it used in 1941, while the newspapers and magazines are compelled to use drastically less in 1943 than in 1941—a year in which their actual supply was below their real needs.

That would be a serious situation if it covered the whole story.

But quite obviously the Government has no intention to limit its use of paper to its contracts this year—and will again repeat its excesses as it did the 2 previous years.

For as Senator WILLIS notes:

"Far more startling—and far more disgraceful at a time when the very freedom of the entire American press is threatened by Government curtailment—is the fact that in the first 3 weeks of this year the Federal Government consumed 115,545,000 pounds of the 350,000,000 pounds under contract for 1943.

"If this rate were to be maintained, the Federal Government could be expected to consume more than 2,000,000,000 pounds of paper in the Government Printing Office in Washington alone in 1943—or 9.6 times as much as it consumed in 1941."

The American people are entitled to wonder and will do well to inquire, what possible—and especially what useful—purpose such a tremendous volume of Government printing can serve.

All of the legitimate and accurate news and information about the Government is faithfully and completely reported by the press—without cost to the Government, and indeed without cost to the people except for the few cents paid for a newspaper or magazine.

Even Government propaganda is fully printed by the press, on the probably proper but often overstrained theory that what the Government wants the people to know should be told.

Surely the Government cannot consider itself isolated from the people in matters of information or even of propaganda since much of the press is friendly to the administration and all of the press reports news accurately and fully, regardless of politics or partisanship.

Surely, then, the Government should be constrained against overconsumption and waste of printing paper—particularly if the available supply of paper is so short as to justify smaller and fewer newspapers and magazines, as the Government insists and requires.

Surely, too, the Government should be constrained against waste of the people's money for printing and publication that does not increase public information and knowledge.

But of course if the Government's real purpose and intention is to cripple and destroy the press, and to be its own printer and publisher and to monopolize all channels of news and information, it is pursuing an effective course.

As Senator WILLIS pointedly remarks, with the Government gorged on paper and with the free press starved for paper, the resulting situation "should more than guarantee freedom of expression to the New Deal, even if newspapers and magazines are reduced to the size of Government questionnaires. The figures speak for themselves, disgracefully and shamefully."

It remains for the American people to decide for themselves if it is in their interest to preserve a free press and—if they so decide—to assert themselves vigorously and promptly to prevent its demoralization and demolition.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to bring to a close the day's session. With the understanding that the Senator from California [Mr. Downey] retains his right to the floor, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ferguson in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the executive calendar.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Louis Bloch, of California, to be program control technician, at \$5,600 per annum, in the San Francisco regional office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the United States Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George Smith Patton, Jr., to be lieutenant general for temporary service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Carl Spaatz, to be lieutenant general for temporary service.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. **BARKLEY**. I ask that the President be notified immediately of all nominations confirmed today, as well as those confirmed yesterday.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations confirmed today and yesterday.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. **BARKLEY**. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, March 16, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 12 (legislative day of March 9), 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Louis Bloch, to be program control technician, at \$5,600 per annum, San Francisco regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE TO BE SURGEONS

Mason V. Hargett
Cassius J. Van Slyke
Erwin W. Blatter

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be lieutenant generals

George Smith Patton, Jr.
Carl Spratz

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Mary L. Mears, Bellflower.
R. Verne Westervelt, Buda.
Hardy E. Altig, Cullom.
Harold E. Price, Grant Park.
William W. Sloan, Rockton.
Charles H. Green, Vandalia.

INDIANA

Breck E. Leach, Merom.
Bernice Bales, Modoc.
Charles A. Good, Monterey.
Martin W. Smith, Mount Vernon.

MARYLAND

Charles H. Wilson, Forest Hill.
Rebecca B. Leaman, Germantown.
James A. Currier, Havre de Grace.
Wilma M. Berg, Mount Hays.

MINNESOTA

Esther C. Saam, Cleveland.
Gilbert P. Finnegan, Eveleth.
Ada L. Davies, Kasota.
Arthur P. Rose, Marshall.

MONTANA

Lovell E. Whitmore, Whitefish.

OKLAHOMA

Monroe Burton, Poteau.

OREGON

Mae M. Humphrey, Boring.
F. Sylvia Brennan, Hines.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Hall H. Armstrong, Bath.

WASHINGTON

Carl V. Elliott, Brewster.
Roy R. Nottage, Sprague.

WEST VIRGINIA

John B. Forinash, Huttonsville.
Stella G. James, Institute.
Cassius O. Shafer, Sr., Lundaale.

WISCONSIN

Wallace J. Millsap, Shawano.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 12, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, for days of health, for nights of quiet rest, for the bounty of Thy goodness and for all Thy blessings bestowed for our need, we give Thee our humble thanks. We praise Thee for our country, our schools, our homes, and for the opportunities which make us grow and develop into self-reliant manhood. Let him who is despondent bring his spirit to the mountaintop of faith, into the radiance and warmth of God's love.

We bless Thee that Thou dost make our mistakes to work and achieve the destiny of our Nation. Nothing can arrest the sweep and power of the divine purpose any more than a storm can stay the light and beauty of a summer day. In the Christ, who hath neither the beginning nor the end of days, we have the revelation of what we would be; by the glory of His marvelous presence we are helped to translate vision from dream into the reality of good character. O Master, on this day set apart for world prayer, we rededicate ourselves to the cause of Christian freedom, may we toil to bring freedom back to all peoples and cause justice and charity to walk again the ways of this burdened earth and Thy name shall be magnified and crowned with the blessing of brotherly love. In the name of our glorified Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PETROLEUM PRODUCTS SENT TO SPAIN

Mr. **BLOOM**. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 150) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas it is currently reported in the public press that Hon. Carlton J. H. Hayes, United States Ambassador to Spain, in a public address at Barcelona on February 26, made the following statement: "I am happy to say that during the last 4 months of 1942 and to date in 1943 the flow of gasoline and other petroleum products from America to Spain has equaled the full capacity of the Spanish tanker fleet. Already by January 1 this year stocks had sufficiently accumulated here to enable Spanish authorities to increase gasoline rations, put more trucks on highways and recently to start street busses running again in Madrid. At the present time the amount of petroleum products available to Spain is appreciably higher than the quantity available for military use to

any other European country, and is considerably larger than the present per capita distribution to people along the Atlantic seaboard of the United States." Mr. Hayes disclosed that in addition to oil the United States is sending Spain big quantities of essential products, including sulfates, cotton, coal, cellulose, industrial chemicals, beans, codfish, and many other items. He said that in order to aid in the rehabilitation of Spanish agriculture the United States had made available to that country during the latter part of 1942 some 25,000 tons of sulfate of ammonia despite the fact there was a scarcity in the United States.

Whereas there is a great shortage of kerosene, fuel oil, and gasoline in New England and throughout the east coast of the United States to the point of causing hardship and suffering from cold during the winter months; and

Whereas it is injurious to people in the United States to give petroleum products abroad when the products are so greatly needed at home: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States is hereby requested to transmit forthwith to the House of Representatives, if not incompatible with the public interest, a complete report showing the amount of petroleum products sent to Spain and other countries in the past 2 years and the amounts contemplated for future shipment.

Mr. **BLOOM**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the State Department be read.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York (Mr. **BLOOM**)?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 11, 1943.
The Honorable SOL BLOOM,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BLOOM: Your letter of March 8 enclosing copies of House Resolution 150, requesting the President to furnish the House information as to the amount of petroleum products sent to Spain, which has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has been received.

The exportation of petroleum products to Spain from the United States during the past 2 years have been:

	Metric tons
1941-----	227,347
1942-----	17,771

These are the only shipments made from the United States in the last 2 years. The last bulk shipment from this country occurred on February 19, 1942.

However, by arrangement between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain, Spain has been permitted in her own vessels to carry through the blockade certain limited quantities of oil bought by Spain in South American ports and transported under the Spanish flag. The movement envisaged in the arrangement was estimated to meet essential needs, especially public utilities and transportation. Under this procedure Spain does not have in stock at any one time a supply for those minimum needs for longer than a 60-day period with respect to any petroleum products except lubricating oil, of which a 90-day limited supply is allowed. Adequate guaranties have been furnished by the Spanish Government to satisfy the British and United States Governments that none of these petroleum products will leave Spain or Spanish territories. The arrangement for the shipment of these quantities of oil was for the purpose of permitting the continuance at a minimum level of the economic life of Spain,